

Also, petition of citizens of Albia, Oskaloosa, Lovilia, Bussey, and Ottumwa, Iowa, for the removal of the duty on raw and refined sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of John Bryce and 20 other citizens of Mount Forest Township, Bay County, Mich., protesting against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petitions of D. J. Stewart, J. B. Weir, M. Hubert, A. C. Beirer, and J. S. Stewart, of Chicago, Ill., favoring reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADISON: Petition from citizens of Kansas, for reduction of duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, to amend the corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Building Managers' Association of Chicago, Ill., favoring House joint resolution 97; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POWERS: Memorial from Mrs. James Bennett, of Richmond, Ky., requesting equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held by the Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, protesting against the enactment of the proposed arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of certain citizens of New Haven, Conn., requesting a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of W. J. Neary and Naugatuck Retail Druggists' Association, of Naugatuck, Conn., protesting against House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Connecticut Merchants' Association, relating to proposed parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of certain citizens of California, asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Resolutions of a mass meeting of the directors of the Bridgeport Business Men's Association, opposing the so-called Sulzer bill to establish a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Business Men's Association of Bridgeport, opposing the Sulzer bill establishing a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of National Association of Shellfish Commissioners, regarding the disposal of sewage and waste and the conservation of resources; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions from the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., urging necessity for immediate amendment of the corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: A resolution of the Rhode Island Anti-Tuberculosis Association, favoring the creation of a committee on public health in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Warren Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: Petitions of certain citizens of North Carolina, urging a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of Local Salem Socialist Party, of Salem, Ohio, requesting support of the Berger resolution relative to the kidnaping of the McNamara brothers; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of Local Union No. 4, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of East Liverpool, Ohio, indorsing the Berger resolution relative to the kidnaping of John J. McNamara; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of Trades and Labor Council of East Liverpool, Ohio, requesting investigation of the kidnaping of the McNamara brothers; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of Canton Lodge, No. 12, International Association of Machinists, of Canton, Ohio, protesting against the kidnaping of the McNamara brothers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITE: Evidence supporting House bills 10796, 10797, 10798, and 10799; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, asking for investigation of the McNamara matter; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of Brooklyn Federation of Labor, asking for investigation of the McNamara matter; to the Committee on Rules.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, June 10, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, imbue us, we beseech Thee, plenteously with heavenly gifts, that with patience, meekness, gentleness, courage, fortitude, forbearance, and brotherly love we may meet the obligations of the hour and quit ourselves like men, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE WOOL SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11019, a bill to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from New York does not care to occupy time in this debate at the present time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not, I would say to the gentleman, at all to-day; Monday I shall be ready to go on.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in advocating at this time the passage of the pending bill, I want to assure the older Members of this House that I do it fully cognizant of the established custom that a new Member is expected to sit, look, and listen rather than be heard.

For 10 weeks, as one of the youngest and I am sure as new as the newest of the Members of this body, I have modestly adhered to that custom, and I would not to-day prematurely impose my remarks into this discussion did I not chafe under the insincerity of the attitude of the gentlemen who oppose this bill.

Mr. Chairman, if my observations and experience in this House have made my convictions stronger on any one fact, that fact is that the Republican Party can not and ought not to be trusted in legislation, and that the future hope and prosperity of the American people must come, and come it will, through the representatives of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the minority, your course in this House during the past 10 weeks has been the course of your party as a majority for 16 years, and that is that you have attempted to hinder, block, and obstruct the enactment of wholesome legislation into law, in accord with the wishes of the American people.

For 16 years, while you as a Republican majority were in control of this House, you were successful, but since you have returned to this Congress, with your forces waning, shattered, broken, disrupted, and divided, with your political days numbered, and your faces drooping under the shame of your broken promises, the spirit of obstruction you still have, but the power is gone. [Applause.]

For years the American people have appealed to you to cease extravagance with public moneys and to administer the affairs of this Government economically. You heeded not their wishes, but continually, year by year, you have defied them, and since the Fifty-third Congress, when you came into control, the appropriations have steadily increased from \$917,013,523.34 to the enormous total of \$2,052,799,400.68 in 1910.

For years the people have seen their wishes thwarted by State legislatures failing to carry out their will in the selection of United States Senators. They appealed to you to give them the right by legislative enactment to choose their Senators by direct vote.

For years there has come a complaint from the people that the trusts and the moneyed interests of the country were contributing to campaign funds and aiding in the election of men to public office who were married to their ideas and bent on carrying out their will.

For years Arizona, as a young babe, has pleaded with you to take her into this family fold of statehood.

For years the American people have bled under the burdened load of a protective tariff. They have carried it bravely, yet complainingly.

Did you gentlemen on that side of the Chamber hearken unto their complaints? No. Intoxicated with power, you ignored their demands, you disregarded their wishes, and you defied their intelligence.

But the American people are a patriotic and an informed people. They knew that your party was wedded to the protective tariff, but only within the past few years did they realize that that union had given birth to such a prolific supply of trusts, which offspring, while apparently innocent in its younger days, under the benign representation of you gentlemen and the nourishing and attentive care of your administration it has grown overbearing, uncontrollable, wicked, and intolerable. [Applause.]

Then it was that the people saw that you were imposing upon them an enormous and an unfair taxation without proper representation.

The same spirit that aroused the American patriotism in the days of seventy-six and sent the echoes resounding into every hamlet of the 13 colonies, that "taxation without representation is unjust," was the same spirit that caused an oppressed people in the November elections last year to exert themselves and retire your party to the side lines, and gave to the Democratic Party hope and assurance of a greater and more glorious victory in 1912. [Applause.]

Can it be doubted that since coming into control of this House the Democratic Party has kept the faith?

Within 10 weeks we have enacted more beneficent legislation for the people than your party has enacted during the past 16 years of its continuous control of this House.

The taking from the Speaker the power of naming committees and the saving of \$182,000 in the expenses of this House alone is a sufficient guaranty that the Democratic Party is representative in character and economical in the administration of governmental affairs.

But these two reforms, Mr. Chairman, were but the beginning of our legislative program to write the people's wishes into law. The passage by this House of a bill compelling the publicity of campaign contributions before as well as after the election; the passage of the bill giving the people the right to choose their own United States Senators; the admission of Arizona and New Mexico into the Union as separate States; the passage of the Canadian reciprocity pact; and the passage of the farmers' free-list bill, which places his agricultural implements on the free list and admits so many necessities of life to the poor people of the country free of duty, is proof sufficient of the good faith of the party and its desire to represent the people.

And while, Mr. Chairman, this House, under the wise, conservative, and able leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], supported by the loyal and patriotic Members on this side of the House, has accomplished much for the American people during this extra session, it is my sincere belief that no bill yet considered by this House means more to all the people than the bill now under discussion.

Since I have listened to the distinguished gentlemen on that side of the aisle attacking this bill and defending inferentially the present Payne law the great differences of opinion that exist among the Republican leaders is made more manifest to me.

It was no less person than the distinguished standard bearer of your party, Mr. Taft, who, in speaking at Beverly, Mass., said:

The woolen schedule is indefensible, and I propose to say so.

And, again, in his Winona speech, he said:

It—the failure to revise Schedule K—is the one important defect in the Payne tariff bill and in the performance of the promise of the platform to reduce rates to a difference in the cost of production, with reasonable profit to the manufacturer.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle and in the other end of this Capitol interpreted their party's platform differently from the President when they wrote the Payne law. Their interpretation is the interpretation voiced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HAYBURN] when he said, in speaking on this schedule in the Senate, during its discussion in the Sixty-first Congress, "That the promise to revise it meant nothing more than to look at it again."

Ah, gentlemen, it was just such perfidious actions as this in framing the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, after promising the people in the campaign of 1908 that if they would again elect you you would revise the tariff, and then offering to them the pitiable excuse that you meant by revision that you would "look at

it again," has aroused them and caused them to repudiate you. [Applause.]

The American people are justified in believing that you represent vested wrongs and fight their legal rights.

No government can be representative when the people's representatives fail to carry out the people's wishes.

The pending bill remedies the iniquities of the present Payne tariff law on wool and woolen goods. It gives to the people the relief they have desired and demanded for years.

Under the present law Schedule K benefits but but two classes of people—the large owners of sheep and the woolen manufacturers. It does not benefit the small owners of sheep, for the very obvious reason that the small pittance they get from protection on raw wool is more than offset by the enormous duties they are compelled to pay to the manufacturers for the finished products.

The sixth district of Mississippi, which I have the honor to represent, produced last year approximately 160,000 pounds of raw wool. We have within that district 244,949 people. According to statistics, one person uses approximately 6½ pounds of wool a year. There is, therefore, used in that district approximately 1,590,000 pounds per year, which is practically ten times as much wool as it produces. Therefore, in order to benefit one man you must take from ten men.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman, that basis is reckoned on 160,000 pounds of raw wool produced and 1,590,000 pounds of raw wool consumed, at the average protection on raw wool of 8 cents per pound.

We have no manufactories of woolen goods in that district. The average ad valorem tax on such finished woolen products as flannels, shawls, blankets, clothing, and so forth, is 90 per cent under the Payne law. So it is, that while a very few of my constituents produce 160,000 pounds of raw wool and are inferentially benefited by the protective duty thereon to the amount of \$12,800, 244,949 people of that district, under the Payne law, are made to pay each year to the manufacturers of the country for the finished products the stupendous sum of \$1,449,175. So, in order to put \$1 into my district by helping one man, it takes from that district \$113 by collecting \$1 from 113 others.

But, Mr. Chairman, my vision is not narrowed to my own district. The 92,000,000 of American people consumed last year approximately 644,000,000 pounds of the finished products of wool at an ad valorem tax amounting to 90 per cent, and the proportion of benefit and discrimination under the Payne law, as exist in my district, is true to a very large extent when applied to the 92,000,000 of American people scattered through every district of our country with the exception of the far western and a few other districts.

Such a system of robbery is wrong and can not longer be defended before the American people. [Applause.]

I have previously stated that this schedule benefits another class—the woolen manufacturers. I want to say in this connection that I do not believe that under the present law the carded woolen manufacturers of the country receive the same benefits as the worsted manufacturers. It is, I believe, conceded by the gentlemen on the other side and is a matter of history that the present Schedule K was framed practically by the worsted manufacturers and the large woolgrowers of the country. I do not know but that Providence designed this combination, because it has been truly said "That when thieves fall out, honest men get their dues," and when the worsted manufacturers, competitors of the carded woolen manufacturers, combined with the woolgrowers and framed Schedule K, with an eye single to the protection of their own interests, and failed to give to the carded woolen manufacturers a sufficient slice of the protective pie, the carded woolen manufacturers "let the cat out of the bag," and then it was that much inside information was given to the American people.

I have attempted to show you how the large woolgrowers of this country rob 92,000,000 American people by the present tariff. Now I desire to analyze very briefly, because my time is limited, some of the paragraphs of the present tariff law whereby the worsted manufacturers are benefited by the agreement.

We find in paragraph 366 of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law the following:

The duty on wools of the first class which shall be imported washed shall be twice the amount of duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed, and the duty on wools of the first and second classes which shall be imported scoured shall be three times the duty they would be subjected to if imported unwashed. The duty on wools of the third class, if imported in condition for use in carding and spinning into yarns or which shall not contain more than 8 per cent of dirt or other foreign substance, shall be three times the duty to which they would be otherwise subjected.

Here it was that the worsted manufacturers placed their joker in the schedule as against the carded-wool people. By this paragraph duties on wools of the first class when imported washed shall be 22 cents per pound, but the duty on wools of the second class when imported washed shall be 12 cents per pound. The carded-woolen people use mostly wools of the first class. Wools of the first class shrink under washing 65 to 75 per cent. The wools of the second class, or the Canadian and English wools, are used mostly by the worsted manufacturers, and they shrink only about 20 per cent.

The carded-woolen people, who, as I have said before, are competitors of the worsted manufacturers, are therefore under the present Payne law made to pay \$22 for about 25 or 30 pounds of wool, while the worsted manufacturers are permitted to pay \$12 for 65 or 70 pounds of wool. Under the pending bill this unjust discrimination is eliminated and the duty is paid on the actual value of the wool; thus the people are given the benefit of just competition between the carded-woolen and the worsted manufacturers.

But this is not the only joker the worsted people placed in the present tariff law against the carded woolen manufacturers.

In paragraph 372, which reads:

Top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, and garnetted waste, 30 cents per pound—

there is placed a duty on top waste of 30 cents per pound. The tops are necessary products in the manufacture of worsted. They are not used by the carded woolen manufacturers.

In paragraph 373, which reads:

Shoddy, 25 cents per pound; noils, wool extract, yarn waste, thread waste, and all other wastes composed wholly or in part of wool and not specially provided for in this section, 20 cents per pound.

Noils, which is a by-product of tops and a necessary product in the manufacture of carded wools, is protected by a duty of 20 cents a pound. Under this system it is necessary for the carded manufacturers, who compete with the worsted people, to purchase these noils from their competitors at unreasonably high prices. Necessarily it follows that the consumers in the end pay the price and the largest beneficiaries are the worsted manufacturers. But, Mr. Chairman, the pending bill abolishes these discriminatory rates and places the same duty on noils as on tops.

Not only, Mr. Chairman, is the joker in the present schedule operative in favor of the worsted manufacturers and against their competitors, but more glaringly is it embodied against the American people. [Applause.]

The history of the Republican Party reveals that its course of legislation has been for the favored few against the toiling many, and in no schedule of the present tariff law is that fact more strikingly illustrated than in the woolen schedule. By it, in practically every instance, the cheaper the goods and the more abundantly used by the laborer and the poorer people of the country, the higher the duty imposed and the greater protection accorded the manufacturer. By it yarns valued at not more than 30 cents a pound will pay a tax of 138 per cent ad valorem, while yarns valued at more than 30 cents a pound will pay only 87 per cent ad valorem.

The laborer's wife, who buys a shawl, pays an ad valorem tax of 92 per cent, while the fashionable society lady, who is gowned in her fine silk dress, is only taxed 57 per cent ad valorem.

Flannels under 40 cents a pound bear an ad valorem tax of 143 per cent, while if they are valued at over 40 cents the ad valorem tax is only 101 per cent.

The blankets, necessities of life, that are used by the poorer classes of people, valued at less than 40 cents a pound, bear an ad valorem tax of 107 per cent, while those that the rich are able to buy bear an ad valorem tax of only 71 per cent. The cheaper the blanket the higher the duty imposed on it. Take a blanket valued at 28 cents a pound, and, under the present law, for every dollar's value in the blanket \$1.65 is added for the manufacturer.

These abuses upon the poorer classes of the American people are unjust and unfair, and by the pending bill these inequities are remedied and the doctrine of equality is practiced upon the rich and poor alike. On blankets, for instance, the ad valorem tax is reduced in some cases from 350 per cent to 30 per cent, and yet it has been asserted on this floor that the pending bill is only a sham reduction.

Not only, Mr. Chairman, does this schedule impose upon the people the heavy taxation on articles named therein, but it gives rise by its very terms to the imposition of heavy taxes on many other articles that apparently were provided for in other schedules.

Paragraph 382 reads as follows:

On clothing, ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls, whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, felts, not woven and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on one pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and, in addition thereto, 60 per cent ad valorem.

In this House only a few days ago I heard, amidst laughter and applause on that side of the Chamber, the distinguished leader of the minority [Mr. MANN] hold up the farmers' free-list bill to criticism, to the evident delight and approval of that side of the House. He said that the term "all agricultural implements of every description" in that bill might be construed to mean everything from an ax to an automobile. He grew facetious in his illustrations. At that time I will be pardoned if I say I doubted the good faith of the gentleman's statement and the sincerity of the applause of his colleagues.

But, Mr. Chairman, since studying this paragraph drafted and championed by the gentlemen on that side of the aisle, I am convinced that they were sincere in that belief.

In this paragraph of the Payne bill, when they use the expression "wearing apparel of every description" and impose on it a tax of 44 cents a pound and 60 per cent ad valorem, they were not satisfied with taxing so heavy the shawls worn by the laborer's wife, the overcoat of the workman, and the clothes of the poor man, but they desired to make it broad enough to tax everything from the hat on his head to the shoes on his feet.

And I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the criticism of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, that I would much prefer being the proponent of the farmers' free-list bill, with the expression "agricultural implements of every kind," extended by the courts, under a liberal construction of its language, so as to embrace axes, saws, hatchets, stoves, and a thousand other things used in connection with a farm, placing all these on the free list and lifting from the backs of the farmers of the country the burden of taxation that heretofore has bowed them beneath its weight, than to be the defender or to have voted for a schedule containing paragraph 382, which uses the expression "wearing apparel of every description," an expression that could be and has been construed to embrace and impose a 40-cent per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem duty on gloves with woolen lining, socks, and on shoes. [Applause.]

By the farmers' free-list bill we say to the courts, "Construe the expression 'farming implements of every description' just as far as you can, in order to lift the burden of taxation from the backs of the American people." By your bill you said to the courts, "Construe the expression 'wearing apparel of every description' just as far as you can, in order to place taxation upon the backs of the American people." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Under the expression in that paragraph, Mr. Chairman, the logman who purchases his gum boots to follow his timber and protect his health, if the lining is of wool, is forced to pay not the 30-cent duty imposed upon rubber goods, but the 44-cent and 60 per cent ad valorem duty imposed upon woolen goods under this schedule.

Mr. Chairman, it can not longer be doubted that the Republican system of protection enriches one class by robbing another. It concentrates wealth in the hands of a few, while it depletes the savings of the many. It causes the flow of wealth from certain sections and classes to certain other sections and classes.

By the very laws of nature we know that good and perfect health is maintained only by the free circulation of the blood to all parts of the body, and that, should congestion set in at any one part of the body, the circulation must be restored or disease and death will inevitably follow.

Just so with the circulation in our commercial life, when we allow its free circulation by inequality of taxation and special privilege, thereby causing the circulation of wealth to congest and concentrate in the hands of a few. Then, unless the remedy is applied and a free circulation restored, disease and death to our whole commercial and political system will speedily and inevitably follow.

Under the census report of 1904 the wealth of our country was \$107,104,211,917, and 70 per cent of this amount was owned by less people than live within my district, while only 30 per cent was owned by 85,517,230 people.

I am informed that when the directors of the United States Steel Trust meet, one-twelfth of the total wealth of the country is gathered there.

Five thousand men actually own one-sixth of the entire wealth of our country.

I desire to embody in my remarks the following statistics of seven corporations of the country, that within the past 13 years, under the benign influence of your protective tariff system, have grown in capitalization to \$2,708,438,754. It is shown, also, that within that time they have acquired control of 1,638 competitive plants.

Statistics taken from *Moody's Encyclopedia of Social Reforms*, edition of 1908.

THE GREATER INDUSTRIAL TRUSTS.

Name of company.	Incorporation.		Number of plants acquired or controlled.	Total capitalization, stocks and bonds outstanding (par value).
	Date.	State.		
1. Amalgamated Copper Co. and affiliated corporations.	1889	New Jersey.	35	\$271,163,000
2. American Smelting & Refining Co. and affiliated corporations.	1899do.....	145	203,100,000
3. American Sugar Refining Co. and affiliated corporations.	1891do.....	160	100,000,000
4. American Tobacco Co. and affiliated corporations.	1904do.....	1200	324,309,000
5. International Merchant Marine Co.	1902do.....	6	176,325,705
6. Standard Oil Co. and controlled companies.	1899do.....	1400	98,338,300
7. United States Steel Corporation and controlled properties.	1901do.....	1792	1,475,201,849
Total (7 greater industrial trusts).			1,638	2,708,438,754

¹ About.

SUMMARY OF INDUSTRIAL TRUSTS.

	Number of plants acquired or controlled.	Total capitalization, stocks and bonds outstanding.
7 greater industrial trusts.....	1,638	\$2,708,438,754
451 lesser industrial trusts.....	5,039	\$,243,175,000
Total of 458 important industrial trusts.....	6,676	10,951,613,754

And while these gigantic trusts were framed and have grown under the protective tariff granted them on various articles of manufacture the present high tariff on wool has contributed its just share to the erection of monopolistic citadels.

In the last preliminary report of the Bureau of the Census on worsted and woolen goods the statistics show that in 1899 there were 1,221 establishments. In 1909 the number had decreased to 913. And although in 10 years the number of establishments had decreased 308 the same statement showed that the capital employed in worsted industries in 1899 was \$256,554,000, while in 1909 it had increased to \$415,416,000—showing that protection destroys competition and concentrates wealth. [Applause.]

The further startling facts are revealed in that report: Worsteds suitings increased in price within that time 136 per cent, worsted dress goods 231 per cent, and Italian worsted cloth 300 per cent.

No wonder, then, that with the price of woolen goods increased in 10 years from double to treble to the consumer that the American Woolen Co. and other manufacturers of woolen goods have been able to rob the American people out of millions of dollars.

Since 1899, when the American Woolen Co. was organized, it has year by year, under the ministering aid of the Republican protective tariff, strangled competition and grown until to-day it has absorbed or controls over 30 of its largest competitors, boasts of capital and surplus of over \$60,000,000, and controls 60 per cent of the worsted manufactures of the country.

And thus it is that through this high tariff on woolen goods the same fact is illustrated to the people—the birth of another trust that can dictate and control the prices of worsted woolens to the consumers of the country.

The bill under discussion, Mr. Chairman, is strictly a Democratic bill, drawn for the purpose of removing the exorbitant taxes from the burdened backs of the people, and at the same time of raising sufficient revenue to run the Government economically. It cures the defects that I have in part pointed out by reducing the tariff on the finished products of wool as well as on the raw material practically half, and is such a bill that ought to merit its passage through both branches of this Congress as well as meet the approval of the American people. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I dislike to indulge too much upon the patience of this House and the courtesy of the gentleman from Alabama, but I desire to digress for a moment.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] some days ago, in this Chamber, in discussing the Canadian reciprocity pact, apparently went out of his way in referring to my State in using this language:

CANADIAN LAND BOOM.

But there are boomers in Canada. They are advertising the wonderful fertility of their soil and the cheapness of the land and the salubrity of their climate. A few years ago fertile lands in the State of Mississippi were advertised in the part of the country where I live at ridiculously low prices, and many of my neighbors disposed of their property and went to Mississippi and bought lands. Those lands felt the effects of the boom and increased in price somewhat, but after a few years of experience every investor that I know of, excepting one, disposed of his Mississippi purchase and came back to good old Indiana a wiser, if not a wealthier, man. It was another Mississippi bubble—a will-o'-the-wisp excursion.

As a Representative in this body from Mississippi, if I should allow that statement to go unanswered on the floor of this House my people would have a right to think that I was not worthy to wear the mantle that they have so generously placed upon me.

I can hardly believe that the gentleman from Indiana really desired to picture my State to the country in false colors. What has she done to the gentleman that would warrant him to pick her out to illustrate some fanciful thought? If he is sincere in the belief that his constituents, in leaving his district to go to Mississippi, were merely "following a will-o'-the-wisp excursion" or another "Mississippi bubble," I would say to him that he is mistaken. It is true that for the past 15 years great hosts of citizens from other States have heard of the wonderful resources and natural advantages of Mississippi and have cast their lots with us. From the gentleman's own State and his own district they have come—not one, but many have come, and not merely one remained, but many of them remained. Citizens from no section were more welcome than they, and none are making greater progress and better citizens than those erstwhile constituents of his. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the distinguished gentleman is ignorant, and I judge that he is, of the progress and true conditions in my State, I gladly cite him to the fact that in my own district lands that a few years ago were worth \$5 an acre are now selling from \$30 to \$50 an acre. Lands that under the cultivation of even boys yield from 75 to 150 bushels of corn to an acre. Lands that produce not one crop a year, but two and three crops a year. Lands that not only produce cotton comparable to any in the South, but which have made the pecan, the vegetable, and orange industries most profitable. Need I cite you to the fact that in one town of my State only two weeks ago 52 carloads of vegetables in one day were loaded and shipped to the markets of the world? [Applause.]

I come from a district that shows an increase in population within the last 10 years of 56 per cent, while the district that the gentleman hails from shows an increase of only 20 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I come from a county whose percentage of increase in the past 10 years was 65 per cent, while that of the distinguished gentleman shows only 7 per cent. [Applause.] The latest census shows the city from which he hails to have increased only 11 per cent, while the city from which I have the honor to hail shows an increase second only in the United States, a most wonderful increase of 502 per cent. [Loud applause.]

And yet in the face of these glaring facts, which the gentleman ought to have known before he made his assertion, the district which I have the honor to represent is considered the most undeveloped of any in my State.

Surely the gentleman would not have this House and the country at large to think that the people of my State advertise that which they have not.

Her rich prairies, her hills, her majestic forests of virgin pine, her fertile lands of the Delta, her navigable streams, her delightful climate, the hospitality of her people, and her wonderful progress within the past 10 years, all answer the assertion of the distinguished gentleman, and are proof sufficient that when once a nonresident lands within her borders a Mississippian he becomes for life. [Applause.]

I am surprised at the distinguished gentleman from Indiana in attempting to praise on the floor of this House the lands of his district at the expense of the fertile lands of my State.

Mr. Chairman, Mississippi needs no voice in this Chamber to defend her natural resources, her progress, and her record.

While the march of her industrial and commercial progress has been wonderful and the prowess of her people marvelous, she has enrolled on the list of great men in American history

as many statesmen and orators, with the exception of Virginia, the mother of States, as any of the sisterhood of States. [Applause.]

Not only has she sent to the other end of this Capitol and to this House men who have taken front rank in American statesmanship, but she has bequeathed to other States men who have shed luster upon those States and glory upon the Nation; and I am proud to-day, Mr. Chairman, to represent in part in this Chamber a State that is not only represented in the other end of this Capitol by two distinguished sons, but which has given to that great deliberative body at the present time five other Senators, "native and to the manor born." [Loud applause.] And here in this Chamber, in this Capital City of the Nation, made illustrious by great men, I would speak to-day to far-away Mississippi and say:

Brave thy men, thy women fair,
Boys and girls beyond compare,
Proud thy records years gone by,
Bright thy prospects drawing nigh.
I love thee, Mississippi.

[Loud applause.]

For fear the gentleman from Indiana might doubt some of the things that I have said of my State, I want to invite him and those of you on that side of the aisle who believe as he to come to Mississippi. The people will welcome you with open arms, and we will show you not a State and a South of negro haters and sectional prejudice, but a State and a South of white supremacy, a South of loyal Americans, a South pulsating with industrial development and singing with commercial prosperity. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in the times of Alexander the Great the Macedonian phalanx was the invincible military formation of the world. It originated in Macedonia before Philip and Alexander, was greatly developed by them, and then was taken up by the Greeks. For centuries it swept all before it.

This formation consisted of spearmen. They were heavily armored and carried great oblong shields to hide the body. They bore but one weapon—a spear 16 feet long. They formed in close order, shoulder close to shoulder, their spears extending. They were ranged in ranks, close together, four, six, eight, and even more deep. Those behind had their spears extended between those in front. It made one solid mass of moving armor and spear points; a formation at first 4,000 men strong, then 6,000, and at last up to 20,000; a great, slowly advancing wall, flanked on either side with armor and spears and likewise backed.

Advancing over flat ground, this huge living military machine carried all before it; with it the Macedonian and Greek armies were invincible until the former tried to conquer Italy. Under Pyrrhus the phalanx went down into the dust before the free formation of Rome.

The Roman soldier, carrying his lighter body armor, his smaller shield, his short double-edged sword, was quicker, more nimble, could move over the field in open or close order. But when he met the phalanx he had a new military problem on his hands; spears, spears, spears, a gigantic oblong of spears; whether in front, on either flank, or in the rear. They bristled like a vast porcupine. How was he to get within arm's reach of the body of the Greek soldier, for do this he must to use his weapon—the short sword. Then was the Roman genius called upon to invent a weapon that should destroy the phalanx. The weapon was produced. It was the pilum, a lance or short spear that could be hurled with great force and accuracy 50 feet or more. Each Roman soldier, with his broadsword by his side and the pilum in his hand, marked out an individual behind the wall of spears. Watching for an exposed part, he hurled the pilum. If but here and there a spearman was struck, he made confusion in falling. There was a wavering of other spears. That was the Roman chance. The legionaries ran in between the points and with their swords had the spearmen, helpless in heavy armor, at their mercy. One such breach made, there was a wedge-like rush from the Roman ranks, and the whole Greek strength was destroyed. Thus it was that Pyrrhus was vanquished. The Roman with his broadsword and his pilum became the world's master.

OUR PHALANX AND PILUM.

Mr. Chairman, the tariff beneficiaries have been the economic and political phalanx for long years in the United States. They have formed one great compact united body. Realizing that they must stand together or be destroyed in detail, they have acted as a mass, their shields spread, their spears advanced; from time to time moving forward to new ground of

vantage; making at all times a common bristling defense against any general attack.

And so it has been until this Congress. In this special session the method of attack on the tariff phalanx has changed. The pilum has now come into use in this Democratic House. This wool bill which we are now debating; the Canadian reciprocity bill and the free-list bill which we have passed; the other schedule bills that may hereafter pass are our Roman lances which we hurl at weak points in the tariff ranks. We break down the spears here, we break down the spears there, we make a breach and widen it with a rush, and then the cry in the tariff ranks is each for himself. Small and insignificant as these bills may appear, they carry destruction. Hurled by this Democratic side in this Congress, the tariff army line will at points be pierced and breached, and the monopoly phalanx which, so long as it could stand intact, was invincible, will end in utter rout and destruction. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have great joy in voting for this wool bill. I do not regard it as much of a bill, but since it unites the Democratic side in battle order it will do. My preference was to have free wool and free woolens, too. I would have liked the bill to declare for free trade in wool and woolens. [Applause.] But, thank you, I shall take what I can get. [Applause.]

I believe that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRANTLEY] is perfectly right in stating that any tariff at all involves protection. I am against any protection whatever, and therefore I am altogether against a tariff. [Applause.] I am against a tariff for revenue, for I regard it as one of the worst ways for raising revenue.

But, Mr. Chairman, suppose that we reach a revenue basis; suppose we cut out much of the tariff, how are we to supplement the revenue? Shall we go to an income tax? Some 30 States have approved of a change in the Constitution that will enable us to do that, and some half dozen more States approving it, Congress will have authority to pass such an act. If I should be a Member of this House at that time, I should take great pleasure in voting for it. [Applause.] It has one merit over a tariff tax; it is direct. You can see it; you know just exactly what you are paying. Who in the world knows what he is paying under a tariff tax?

A MEMBER. Or who gets it?

Mr. GEORGE. Aye, or who gets it? For, as has been said of old, the tariff is a device for getting the most feathers with the least squawking. [Laughter and applause.]

But, while an income tax is better than a tariff tax, I am opposed to it. For why should we have an income tax? Why should we tax incomes? Men toil away their days in trying to get incomes; getting them, why should they not keep them to spend as they please? Why should the Government tax any part into the public Treasury? To support the Government, it is said. But to get support in that way is all a mistake. The British have had a high income tax, but they are now lowering it. The whole trend of taxation is away from that idea. The march of enlightenment opposes a tax of any kind upon production. It opposes personal property taxes. It opposes taxation upon the improvements on land—upon dwellings, stores, factories; upon the buildings of the farmer, his fences, ditches, drains—opposes the taxation of anything and everything that comes from human toil.

THE SINGLE TAX.

To him that produceth, to him should go the fruits thereof. This is getting to be the current of thought. Consequently I believe that just so surely as this country shall establish an income tax that surely will the mass of those who pay it become active in quest of some substitute tax. They will be far more active against an income tax than they may now be against a tariff tax, because an income tax is direct in its incidence. It can be seen plainly by the man who pays it. A tariff tax is indirect. It can not be so easily seen. It is indirect in its incidence. Therefore these income-tax payers will rebel against this tax upon their industry. They will look for some kind of a tax that will raise revenue, but not tax thrift.

What tax will do that? A tax on land values. That will do it; do it absolutely. It will fall on privilege, and not any part of it on toil.

This brings us to a consideration of the single tax philosophy. I am a single taxer. I do not believe in taxes upon any kind of industry, or upon anything that comes from industry. I believe the whole burden of taxation—Federal, State, and municipal—should fall upon monopoly. I believe it should fall upon the mother of all monopolies; upon the earth; upon that value which comes to any piece of land not by reason of the toil of

its owner—for all improvements should be exempted—but from the development of the community; from social growth and social improvement.

That part of New York City known as Manhattan Borough, Manhattan Island, has land officially valued at more than three thousand million dollars. The island was bought from the Indians by the Dutch traders in the seventeenth century for \$24 worth of calico and glass beads. Yet now that same piece of land stands on the tax books at three thousand millions. That is the official value of the ground alone. It does not include the value of buildings or other improvements of any kind. Who made the increase in value from \$24 to three thousand million dollars—who but all the people? The coming of population did part; the birth of babies did part; the laying out of streets, the making of great public improvements, the general toil, the building this island into a great center of production, of manufacturing and trade made parts. Social growth and social improvement brought this value to that piece of land. Why should it not be taken into the Public Treasury for social uses? Why not abolish all other kinds of taxes and take this publicly-made value for the uses of government—municipal, State, and Federal?

Now, such action is not so far away. Bills are in the State legislature to abolish the personal-property tax and to reduce taxation on improvements on land. This would involve a corresponding increase in the tax now falling on the ground value.

To tax land values, ground values, alone is not a mere dream. It is not the utterance of a man so far in the advance of practical affairs as just to be listened to for a brief hour and then be dismissed. My colleagues, it is a principle that is now and here. It is claiming the grave attention, shaping the legislation, of the advanced nations of the earth. It is in the Orient; it is in the Occident; it is in the Antipodes; it is amongst the progressive people to the north of us with whom we are seeking closer ties; it has made a momentous, convulsive drive forward in Great Britain.

IN PROGRESSIVE JAPAN.

In progressive Japan, for instance, they have just made a substantial advance in this method of taxation. It has come through the simple process of a better valuation of the land. Japan has all manner of taxes. It has tax-burdened production in a multitude of ways; it has had great need of revenue; it is a country long given to agriculture and now beginning to manufacture; it has within 15 years sustained two great wars, one with China, the greatest power in Asia; the other with Russia, supposedly the greatest military power in Europe. It has large and growing public expense—cost of railroads, for the railroads there are Government roads, as are the telegraphs and the telephones. It has cost of rural roads, public buildings, schools—the school system is ours transplanted. It has cost of reconstructed cities, with public water and sewer service, with wide and straight streets; cost of modern occidental administration and police. Then, since it is in the midst of volcanic nation-making and nation-destroying Asiatic economic and political forces, it needs, or believes it needs, a large military establishment, a big army, more and better ships. The ships it would have to have by its special treaty with Great Britain, since it must by that pact police the Asiatic waters so that Great Britain, its ally, may withdraw some of her own fleet back to the Mediterranean and to home waters.

All this requires revenue, more and increasing revenue. Where get it? The poor of Japan are weighed down with taxation; all production is hampered by it. Where get more revenue? The premier, Marshal Marquis Katsura, found the way in taxation of land values. He put through the Diet an act for a new valuation of the lands of the cities. The cities had grown enormously in the last four decades. Individuals had made fortunes out of rising land values. The land tax rate was very small and there had been no revaluation in 35 years. His act called for a new valuation. It was made; and on this, the same tax rate being applied, brought a handsome increase in the revenue.

TAXING LAND VALUES IN GERMANY.

In Germany the constant cry has been for more revenue. It has not been a cry of "mere theorists"; it has not been a notion of "impractical" men. It has been the problem of practical statesmen; the question of how to raise sufficient revenue to meet the needs of Government, such as faces every legislature in the world. How raise enough revenue? It had long been realized that land was valued in Germany following methods of the Middle Ages. The value was determined by the yield of the land, not its market price. The small farmer's land and the small merchant's land yielded a relatively large produce; therefore it was valued high. The great lord's parks

and hunting grounds and the speculator's unimproved tracts about a growing city yielded little or no produce; therefore that land was set at a low valuation. Various of the German States had authorized their municipalities to make new valuations, abandoning this yield-of-the-land process and adopting the market-price method. It worked admirably. It brought in revenue and discouraged the holding of idle lands.

The Reichstag presently followed that same line. It put through a bill to make a selling-price valuation of land, then to tax that. But since the municipalities claimed this land-values tax as a municipal privilege, the Imperial Government compromised with the lesser governments. It divided the revenue so raised with the other governments. Fifty per cent of this revenue was to go to the imperial exchequer, the other 50 per cent to be divided between the local and the State governments.

In this way a land-values tax is raising an abundance of revenue where formerly it yielded next to nothing. Moreover the small landowner is paying little; the great landowner much. Should Germany carry that policy further and increase the tax, there would be in land values—values made by the population of Germany and not by the landowners alone—a sufficient revenue to meet all the governmental needs, Imperial, State, or municipal. Then all the other taxes—tariff taxes, income taxes, stamp duties, and every other tax devised for revenue raising—could be reduced, and, if desired, totally abolished.

IN AUSTRALASIA.

But it is when we turn to the people of our own stock and language, to the people in the antipodes, for instance, that we see how easily this principle of taxation might be applied to our conditions in this country; for in New Zealand they have many taxes, but they raise one-sixth of their revenue by a tax on land values. In determining this value they consider ground alone—what the political economists call the "economic rent of land." It is that value attaching to a given piece of land exclusive of any value of the improvements that may be upon it.

In Australasia they have what Henry D. Lloyd called the "Australasian tax." It is merely a small ground-value tax. It was resorted to to hit the speculators who went in advance of the pioneers, acquiring the land and holding it against use until they got their price. They would not use it themselves; they would allow others to use it only at the price of being bought out. They penalized production.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houston). Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. With pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. In fixing the value of the land for the purpose of taxation they do not, you say, take into consideration any improvements? Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. In Australia?

Mr. NORRIS. In New Zealand I think the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, they get only one-sixth in New Zealand. Only one-sixth of the revenue is raised by taxing land values. Other things are taxed for the other five-sixths of the revenue—largely the things produced by labor.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman for information whether in fixing the value of the land you are going to tax you consider the improvements on that land?

Mr. GEORGE. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, in fixing this value on any particular land you are going to assess, would you take into consideration the value of improvements on adjacent and adjoining land?

Mr. GEORGE. You take the market value of the land—what it would sell for in the open market.

Mr. NORRIS. If it had no improvement on it?

Mr. GEORGE. As though it had no improvement on it; what it would sell for in the open market. That market price is the sum of advantages of the situation. It is determined by all the circumstances; if there be public streets or other public improvements, for instance; if there be improvements on adjoining lots—all such considerations enter into value.

Mr. NORRIS. So that you would not consider the improvement of the land you are fixing, but you would consider the other improvements on other land that had a tendency to put a value into that land which you were taxing?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but you would not have to bother about that. You simply determine the selling value of the land—

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

VANCOUVER.

Mr. GEORGE. And the man who buys land always considers those circumstances. Up north of us, in Canada, they have applied in Vancouver, British Columbia, what is called the "single tax." It is not a full single tax, since county,

provincial, and Dominion taxes are laid; but it is the only revenue tax laid by the city of Vancouver. There is no taxation upon personal property or improvements on land. So far as local revenues are concerned, it is a single tax; but it is not the single tax I am advocating, since the Vancouver tax is very small in amount—not sufficient to check the great land "boom" that is now in progress there in consequence of the exemption of buildings and all other improvements from taxation.

The city began some years ago by exempting 25 per cent of the value of improvements from taxation. That worked so well that 50 per cent were exempted. Then they exempted 75 per cent; and for two years, I think it is, they have entirely removed improvements from the tax rolls. The course of personal property exemption was similar. No personal tax now exists there. The sole source of revenue in that advancing city is the land value, ground value; the value called "economic rent" by the political economists.

As a result, Vancouver has increased in improvements faster than any city in the world. I was informed by Mayor Taylor during a visit there that the increase in Vancouver's improvements during the last year was 87 per cent. There being no tax on buildings or other things a man might put on his land, industry and thrift are encouraged.

Indeed, there is so much benefit from this policy that land values are rising. There is very active speculation in land. The advantages from the exemption of improvements is likely to be absorbed by land speculation. Against this the people of Vancouver will be compelled to defend themselves by increasing the tax rate on land values.

But this aside, the idea of exempting improvements from taxation is spreading all through western Canada. Wherever tried it is working most prosperously. And nowhere, in Canada, Australia, or anywhere else, is there the least disposition to go back to the old taxes. The people in Washington and Oregon, as you can find if you go out to those States, are looking with amazed eyes at Canada and her exemption of industry from any taxation. Attracted by that, many are going up over the border. Many more will most assuredly go unless those Western States shall adopt a similar policy of exempting improvements from taxation.

Some say the farmers would object to this single tax. But have we not seen in the newspapers how the Canadian farmers from the west went to the Dominion Parliament and asked for the adoption of the reciprocity treaty with us? They offered to make up any loss of revenue by submitting to a tax upon land values. They believed that they would get benefits from even that small measure of free trade with the United States, and were willing to pay for such benefit by accepting a tax upon ground values—on the ground values alone, of course, less all improvement value. Certainly, this is an answer to any who say that the farmers of this country would never bear such taxation. For, let me repeat, this tax is upon land values and those values exclusively—ground values. When you come to consider the values in a farm you find that they are largely betterments—improvements the farmer's labor has wrought. Exempting them, the value that remains to be taxed is very much shrunk up. Moreover, speculative value in the land would lessen. Indeed, speculative value would disappear with heavy taxation of land values.

THE BRITISH BUDGET FIGHT.

But it is to Great Britain that we must turn for the most extraordinary instance of advancement along this line. The budget fight, of which the world has heard, was nothing but a fight with landlords over a tax upon land values. The Right Hon. Lloyd George, chancellor of the exchequer, framed the budget and led the fight. He is, I believe, the most wonderful politician in the world. He rose from the ranks. He came from the Welsh Hills, ate of the bitter bread of poverty, practiced humbly as a lawyer, and then reached Parliament. He came face to face with all the great social and political problems of his day. None were more difficult than the taxation problem. The Conservative, or landlord, party was proposing to revive protectionism in the United Kingdom and so make privilege more secure. George struck at this with a land tax. He brought in a budget in most respects just like other budgets of many years running in its main features. His budget contained a slight difference. It was a little bit of an item—a tax to fall on land values. The tax was divided into two parts: A part was to fall upon the value of land at the time of its sale; the other part was to be an annual charge upon land.

At the time of presenting his budget to Parliament, Lloyd George explained that, preceding the laying of the tax, there would have to be a revaluation of the land of the United Kingdom; that some of the valuable land of the realm had not been

valued since the time when the Stuarts were kings; and that there was some land that yet stood valued as it was in the days when the Norman William crossed the channel and took the crown from the Saxon Harold.

The matter of valuing the land was not to be done by public officials, as is our common practice. Under the budget it was to be done by the landlords themselves. They were to be invited to make out schedules, and upon these schedules the tax would be imposed.

Imagine any proposition of that sort in this country! Imagine the great trusts of this country, at whose core is the most valuable land, coming to the tax office and making their own valuation for public taxation! And yet Lloyd George invited the British landlords to do just this.

And upon a valuation so derived he proposed in the first instance to lay a tax. How much of a tax do you suppose? Why, one-fifth of 1 per cent. One-fifth of 1 per cent! Why should there be any hullabaloo about that? One-fifth of 1 per cent! The landowners of New York City paid more than 2 per cent on their land values this year. They paid more than ten times the amount the British landlords were under the Lloyd George budget asked to pay.

Mr. SIMS. Was it not also proposed to take for the Government, in the way of a tax, a part of a sum called a fine on the renewal of an expired lease or upon the making of a new lease of real estate?

Mr. GEORGE. I am coming to that. There was the other part of the budget proposition. The Government proposed to take note of the valuation any owner should make for taxation purposes, and again when the land should be sold—six months, a year, five years, or whenever afterwards. Should the value at the sale show any increase over the value made for taxation purposes, the Government was to treat it as an "unearned increment"—that is, as unearned by the landlord. Of this "unearned increment" the Government was to take 20 per cent.

As for the amount of revenue to be raised under this tax on land values, it was preposterously small. It actually called for only £500,000 on one estimate and £600,000 on another. This amounts to \$3,000,000 of our money. What would we say to a Federal tax that was going to raise \$3,000,000 of our money? Why, \$3,000,000 would not pay a third or a fourth part of one of the super-Dreadnought killing machines that we think we have to add to our Navy, in these days of profound peace. Why, Mr. Astor, the gentleman who expatriated himself and went over to England to become a British subject, could have paid out of his Manhattan Island rents which he still exacted that amount of money and not thought of it. He had just bought an old castle—I do not know what date it goes back to—and he was fixing it up and refurbishing it. He will, first and last, spend several times \$3,000,000 and not think of it. The Duke of Westminster, the Duke of Bedford, or any other of the half dozen of the great London landlords could have paid that \$3,000,000, or £600,000, and not been hurt one bit; indeed, scarcely noticed the amount.

THIN EDGE OF THE WEDGE.

Why, then, all the opposition we have read of? Because the lords perceived in this small tax the thin edge of the wedge. A small tax rate this year; but with a valuation made, the tax might be heavy next year and heavier the year after.

Besides, the chancellor of the exchequer had in public speeches invited municipalities to consider whether they would not like to take this imperial land valuation as a basis for a little local revenue raising; knowing, as all the Kingdom knew, that London, Glasgow, Dublin, and a hundred other of the chief cities and local governing centers had petitioned Parliament for just such permission.

What wonder, then, that the lords rose up and howled. They called Lloyd George a thief. Worse than that—listen, you lawyers, in this House—they called him an attorney! If there are any Welshmen here, beware! for when their wrath broke all bounds they called him a "Welshman!"

And of the Liberal Party the lords cried:

They are pulling down the pillars of the State. They are destroying the British constitution. They are dragging to the grave the greatest nation on earth.

Let me tell you, gentlemen, Lloyd George and his progressive party were pulling down coroneted landlordism. The tax was small, but British privilege knew its import. The tax was small then, but it is going to be increased, not only as an imperial tax, but Lloyd George has since been making speeches inviting the municipalities to consider the Imperial Government valuation of land as a tax basis for local revenues.

So here we have the way made clear to us. The great people from whom our institutions have come, from whose loins the body of our people originally sprang, have fought down any

proposal to return to protectionism; they have reduced income taxation, and in furious political conflict they have laid the foundations for taxing land monopoly. And in all this the English, Irish, Scotch, and Welsh radicals have stood together as never before in the politics of the United Kingdom.

Great Britain has much freedom of trade. They do not tax imports that compete with things produced in Great Britain. They do tax some of the things not produced there, but purely for revenue purposes. These taxes may go before a great while. The land-values tax is small now, but it is likely to grow fast because of those who oppose it—the landed aristocracy.

Why should we not apply this taxation principle to this country? Why should we not go to land values for all our revenues? We get part there; why not all? Abolish the tariff and other taxes on production and increase our present taxation on land values. If the older countries find it good, if the newer parts of the world, Australia and Canada, find it good, why should not this country find it good?

Is there in any part of the world a greater, more damaging, more damning kind of land monopoly than there is in this country? Can you find in any part of the world landlords who are so great, so mighty, as they are in this country of ours? Where will you find, among the peerage of Europe, dukes or earls or counts or viscounts so powerful from their landed possessions as are simple citizens in our country?

A steel trust has vast possessions. Those possessions form the very core of its monopoly. An oil trust has great landed possessions—vast possessions, of which it chooses to use only a small part, shutting all the rest off from use by anybody. You will find the roots of most of the trusts down in land monopoly. Why not apply the single tax? All the revenue raised in this country—our Federal revenue, our State revenue, our local revenue—amounts in round numbers to \$2,000,000,000 a year. The ground-rent roll of the country probably approximates four thousand millions, so that there is an ample source of revenue for all revenue needs.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Will the gentleman there allow an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. NEEDHAM. It may interest the gentleman to know that the irrigation district in which I live in California has within the past two weeks, by popular vote, voted to exempt the irrigation improvements from all taxation in the State of California.

Mr. GEORGE. I congratulate the State of California.

Land monopolies such as were scarcely seen before; land monopolies such as find example only, if there be any comparison whatever, in the ancient times, in the imperial days of Rome, exist here. The great Warwick, the kingmaker, could go to Parliament with 600 liveried men. But a simple citizen, a Carnegie or any one of a large number that any of us might name, could, if he chose, have not 600 but 6,000—we might say, in some instances, 60,000—retainers, should he choose to go abroad in such a style.

Whence comes all this? Primarily from ownership of the soil. That is the very essence of these monopoly fortunes. Given a condition where the few own the soil that all the others living there must use for their subsistence, then the few are the masters of the many.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has alluded to Mr. Carnegie. Does he think he is accurate in giving the impression that Mr. Carnegie's fortune came as the result of the ownership of land?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I do; mainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to have the gentleman amplify that statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Carnegie was born in Scotland. He came to this country and worked as a boy in a cotton mill in Allegheny City, Pa. Then he worked as a telegraph operator in Pittsburgh, across the river; then as an employee of the Pennsylvania Railroad, later as its Pittsburgh superintendent, and from that position with the Pennsylvania Railroad to back him, he stepped out into the manufacture of iron and steel. What did he know about iron and steel? He could not make a ton of iron or steel. But he had two things: He had associated with him a genius who could make iron and steel, and he had the Pennsylvania Railroad behind him, with the same kind of secret contracts or understandings that Rockefeller had about

that time with the railroads for the carriage of oil. Carnegie not only had orders for rails, wheels, bridges, and other structural iron and steel, but he had special rates for the carriage of finished and unfinished products to and from mines and mills. By reason of these rates he was enabled to underbid all competitors.

Much of this is told by Mr. Carnegie himself in his brief biographical sketch. But in his most recent book, *Problems of To-day*, he describes in exact terms and with precise instances the greatest factor in the production of the great combinations and great individual fortunes. He says it lies in the monopoly of land.

It was by holding a monopoly of the Connellsville coal fields, the best coking coal in the world, and subsequently by possession of practically all the best or most available iron and steel ore in the country that the United States Steel Corporation received material advantage over all competitors, sufficient, at any rate, to force a gentlemen's agreement with competitors here, while the tariff shut off competition from without.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I am not in any sense defending, even by questions, the method by which Mr. Carnegie obtained his fortune. Neither am I criticizing it. The gentleman's statement did not seem to me to indicate wherein in any accurate use of the word "land" Mr. Carnegie's fortune was dependent upon it. I would like to have the gentleman define just what he means by "land."

Mr. GEORGE. By "land" I do not mean mills, I do not mean railroad tracks, I do not mean anything made by labor. By "land" I mean the superficies of the earth. By "land" I mean the thing on which we stand, from which we came, to which we return.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us define the definition, because the very question of what is meant by land, to my mind, is the crux of the whole proposition upon which the gentleman builds his superstructure of land values and land taxation. He says he means that which, if I may paraphrase his language, is the gift of nature and not the result of man's handiwork. Does he consider iron ore when it comes out of the land to be land within the meaning of his definition?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, to the extent that the general ownership of iron ore produced the fortune, it did not relate to land?

Mr. GEORGE. I call land that which nature offers to man before man has put his hand to it.

Mr. SHERLEY. In that sense, there is practically nothing; there is no value at all until he puts his hand to it.

Mr. GEORGE. I can have a vacant lot here in Washington, and it may lie just as it was at the time the Indians—if there were ever Indians here—occupied it. I can sell it for a price. Yet not a stick or a stone has been touched upon it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; it has a potential value.

Mr. GEORGE. It has an actual value, for value proceeds not only from labor, but also from a power to exact labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, observe the Coal Trust. I do not believe that any amount of regulation, any amount of examination into financial accounts, any amount of acts here in Congress for the reorganization, if you please, of the Coal Trust will do any lasting good. You pass regulations and set up regulators, and then you have got to have somebody regulate the regulators. [Laughter.] The only way to hit a combination like the Coal Trust is to hit the monopoly principle underlying it.

THE ANTHRACITE COAL TRUST.

Take the Anthracite Coal Trust in Pennsylvania. It possesses practically all of the hard-coal land of that State. Nature has put into eastern Pennsylvania a great deposit of hard coal. It has been the business of the anthracite railroad companies, beginning with the Reading Railroad years ago, to get possession of these deposits by purchase, by long lease, and by contract for the carriage of the coal. These railroads acting together have in these ways got control of the hard coal of all eastern Pennsylvania. The purpose has not been to mine coal. It has been, rather, not to mine coal. Its purpose has been to limit the output and to force up the price of coal. Its purpose has been to work only a part of its land and only a small part, and to let the remainder lie idle, as though it did not exist, and to keep others from the use of it. Why could they do that? There was no tax upon it, no penalty on their doing it. The law does not discourage it; nor does even public opinion. People do not realize that it could and should be stopped; that it could be absolutely destroyed by the simple process of taxation. The law of Pennsylvania requires a tax on the market value of that land. The actual practice is not to assess at the market value, which would be as valuable mineral land. The practice is to assess it as inferior agricultural land. Then, the tax upon that preposterously low valuation is very small, so

that these great coal barons go practically without taxation upon their holdings.

But if we were to make an absolute market value and put that upon the tax books, and then increase the tax upon that valuation, you would see whether the Anthracite Trust could hold its lands idle or keep the price of its coal high. Its purpose then would not be to make a scarcity in output in order to put up prices and keep down the wages of labor by limiting opportunities for employment. A heavy tax upon the real market value of these lands would compel their use. Their use would mean more demand for labor. The price of labor would go up in the hard-coal regions. Because of the larger output of coal, the price of coal would go down. The consumers of coal in the United States would get cheaper coal. The laborers in the coal regions would have higher wages, shorter hours, and God knows their little boys would not have to work in the breakers or their little girls go into the silk mills to help get the family subsistence. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I wish to ask the gentleman a question simply for information. I am very much interested in his statement. The method of taxation which the gentleman is expounding so very ably would result in what is known as expropriation eventually, would it not, of the coal lands? That is to say, the title of the coal lands would pass to the State, would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. No, sir.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Probably.

Mr. GEORGE. No, sir. I should not say "expropriation" was the right word. The word of opprobrium that is usually applied is "confiscation."

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I was using the other word; but would it not result probably in the acquirement of the title to the coal lands by the State?

Mr. GEORGE. No, sir.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. You think that the corporations would be able to continue to pay the tax and to sell the coal?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; the whole policy would be to use land, not to hold it out of use. Instead of high prices and small sales of the mined coal, there would be large sales at low prices.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. I will ask the gentleman two questions. The assertion was made by the gentleman from New York that under some changed conditions the boys would not be allowed to work in the breakers of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman not aware of the statute there that prohibits boys from working in the breakers?

Second, with reference to the labor problem, does not the gentleman know that in the mining section there is a perfectly satisfactory agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and the producers of coal?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not know either one. I do not mean to say that the law would have to forbid young children from working. As a matter of fact, the law does, not only in Pennsylvania, but in California, in New York, in the South, and all over the United States. It forbids children under a certain age from working at all, but their parents, driven by poverty, have to lie about their children's ages. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, what was the second question?

Mr. FOCHT. Is there not a satisfactory agreement between the United Mine Workers and the coal producers?

Mr. GEORGE. The gentleman asks me if I am not aware that there is a satisfactory relation between the United Mine Workers and the mine owners of Pennsylvania. I know that it is satisfactory in a state of war. I do not deny that. I am not talking about that. I am talking about a condition where men do not have to join labor organizations in order to get even a small measure of social justice. [Applause.] I stand for unions. I am the son of a trade-unionist. I went to the printer's trade myself. If I were working at a trade, I should certainly be an active trade-unionist; but I do not consider that a natural condition. It is an unnatural condition. It is a condition where men who have nothing but their labor to sell must band themselves together into an organization, offensive and defensive, to make the best terms of sale they can in respect to price, to time, and the like. [Applause.] I do not regard that as natural. I regard it as unnatural. That is the kind of arrangement that has to be made by men in a state of industrial warfare. The condition I am talking about is of men in a state of freedom; where every man can look every other man in the eye as a free man.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, if the gentleman will permit, assuming the correctness of his statement, that a tax of this kind would result in the lowering of the price of coal because of the neces-

sity to mine and sell it, does the gentleman also think that such a tax would help conservation of the natural resources?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care anything about this conservation of natural resources if I am permitted to apply the single tax. If you are asking me what I should do toward the conservation end, I answer that I should not bother about it, for that tax would take care of it. What do the conservationists want to do—keep the public lands out of the hands of monopolists and speculators? Well, if you hit land monopoly with taxation, no man will want to own land simply for monopoly's sake. Monopoly's profit would be gone. The single tax would tax land monopoly to death in the United States. Any value attaching to land would be taken into the Public Treasury and used by all. Therefore there would be no advantage in getting hold of farming land or mineral land or timber land or urban or suburban land unless the man so acquiring wanted to use it. If he simply wanted to get it to be a monopolist or a speculator, he would have no advantage, since that value would be taken into the Public Treasury.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman consider that there is any difference in principle as to the view that the Government should assume toward private property that consists of land and private property that consists of things other than land; and, if so, what is the basis for it?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; a very great difference; for who made this world? God Almighty. And for whom did he make it? For all men, without any distinction whatsoever; and if anything in man's laws belies that everlasting truth, it must in the end go down. But as to other things—this building, a newspaper, a book, glass, iron, things that we see here about us, or any similar things outside—they have come from man's exertion. Their title springs originally from labor. I see a vast difference, for instance, in property in the ocean and in property in the fish taken by labor out of the ocean.

Mr. SHERLEY. Very well, but can the gentleman state any condition of land ownership that does not have a value as the result of man's labor?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the gentleman mean the owner's labor only?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, we are not discussing the labor of the owner. We are discussing man's labor. The gentleman undertakes to make the distinction between those things that are the gift of God and those things that are the result of man's labor. Now, it is a perfectly proper distinction if it exists, but if it is applied artificially to things, then the whole fabric based upon it must fall.

Mr. GEORGE. I said that that value should be taken into the Public Treasury which was the consequence of social growth, meaning increase of population; and of social improvement, meaning the laying out of streets, the putting in of grades and bridges, the erection of public buildings, the watering, sewerage, lighting, heating, the providing of transportation for the city, and matters of that sort. This value comes from the exertion of the community and the increase in numbers of the community. It is a public value, and should be so considered and be publicly taken.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I am not quarreling with that statement, that so far as an unearned increment is concerned it belongs more to the community than to the individual who is the fortunate possessor of it; but the proposition the gentleman announced in answer to my question was that he differentiated between private land ownership and private ownership of other property, and when I asked him why, he said because he considered land to be the gift of God and private property to be the act of man's labor. When I asked him to further evolve that he brings me back to the proposition of unearned increment.

Now, the whole meat of the gentleman's position, as it was of his father's book—one of the most interesting and epoch-making books ever written—was that very question. It is the crux of the whole proposition, whether land, as he uses the word "land," represents something that belongs to the community at large any more than the other property.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; the land was made by God, and the value that attaches to it may be quite apart from the owner's labor. The owner may do nothing. Any value that attaches to that particular piece of land is a public value. To illustrate: Here you have in the center of Washington a lot, a vacant piece of property. It has nothing whatever upon it. It has never been improved in any way. Yet it has a selling value and will increase in price. Who made that value? Surely not the labor of the man owning the land. He did not turn a hand. He might have gone into the mountains as did Rip Van Winkle and slept for 20 years, and returning, found a value in his

land that he had nothing to do with making. Why should not such value be taken as a public value? I certainly separate it from any value that might be put upon that land in the way of a house or a machine; whether it be a well dug there or a shaft sunk here or a building erected. Such value perfectly clearly is a private value and belongs to labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman a half an hour additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 minutes longer.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this land-value tax meets as no other kind of a tax does the four canons of taxation. First of all, as laid down by Adam Smith, the father of political economy, in his *Wealth of Nations*, it is the most equal kind of a tax.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Just a moment. A little while ago I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. We have traveled some little distance from the inquiry which I desired to make, but I fancy it is still pertinent, and I would be glad to have the gentleman explain to us a phase of the question he is discussing. He stated that by the operation of the method of taxation which he is advocating monopoly would be destroyed, a monopoly of coal holdings, for illustration. I want to know where the title of the property would go when the monopoly is destroyed by this method of taxation.

Mr. GEORGE. Gentlemen, I do not know whether you heard the question. The gentleman asked where the title of the land would go if we were to apply the single tax in full.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Yes; under the gentleman's theory.

Mr. GEORGE. Exempting all other taxes and applying a single tax, in other words, the title of the land would stay where it is. We do not propose to change titles.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That is, it would stay in the company?

Mr. GEORGE. It would stay in the company or individual, or whoever now calls himself owner. He would still be the owner, but—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But he is killed—

Mr. GEORGE (continuing). Only subject to a large tax instead of a small tax.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But he is killed; you have stated you have killed him.

Mr. GEORGE. We have killed monopoly's powers by taxing the value of land used and of land that is not used. You force the land into use. The power of monopoly is the power to hold land out of use.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But could not the monopoly, having to pay the increased tax, charge the increased tax upon the consumer?

Mr. GEORGE. I invite the gentleman to consider the political economists. This is one thing in political economy that is not in dispute.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Might he not undertake to do that, as he does it now in coal properties?

Mr. GEORGE. No, sir. When you put a tax on production, you limit production. Men will not produce unless they can get compensation for the tax. They add the tax to the price of the product, and thereby they get recompensed for the tax. But not so when you tax land values.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But suppose you have an actual monopoly, a natural monopoly?

Mr. GEORGE. I will answer it; wait a minute. By putting a tax on land values you do not lessen the amount of land. You can not lessen it by one grain. It is just the same in amount. But you will increase the available quantity. You will force land into use that has been kept out of use by speculation. This will put down the price of land, instead of putting it up.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Precisely. Now, if I understand the gentleman, this coal monopoly which he is discussing is a monopoly which controls coal lands and is lying dormant so far as the actual mining of a part of its lands is concerned. It is proposed, then, to tax it so as to compel it to dig all of its coal as rapidly as possible and put it upon the market, so as to be able to pay the increased tax, and that, failing to do this, the monopoly must die. But the gentleman denies the monopoly would actually die so far as the actual mining of coal is concerned. Am I right that it would have to be more active and mine more coal?

Mr. GEORGE. Or else give the land up?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Or else give the land up.

Mr. GEORGE. If the trust shall itself use the land it is now holding shut up, then it practically becomes broken as a trust, because the feature of monopoly has gone, the essential part of which is to withhold from use the natural resources and thereby make a higher price for the product from such parts as are used.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. If the gentleman will pardon me just a moment. Suppose the gentleman's theory, then, is correct, and the public refuses to pay the increased price of coal which the corporation has been obliged to impose in order to pay the increased tax, and then the monopoly is unable to pay the tax, does not the monopoly then lose its coal property, and does it not, then, go to the State?

Mr. GEORGE. No, sir. If the land contains valuable coal, and the trust will not pay the tax, then somebody will take the land who will. Valuable land does not run around without an owner. Somebody will use it. If the Coal Trust will not use that land, somebody else will, subject to the tax.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The grantee himself takes it at the same rate as the original owner, does he?

Mr. GEORGE. If the owner does not want to use the land and yet, because the tax is too heavy he can not afford to hold it idle, he will sell it for whatever he can get, subject to the tax by the State. I am not proposing to change titles. I am not a Socialist. I do not propose to put land into the hands of the Government. I do not propose Government management of land. I propose the plain application of the Thomas Jefferson principle of the least possible government. I propose to tax out speculators and monopolists and to throw land open to private initiative.

Mr. RAKER. In answer to the question just propounded to the gentleman from New York, suppose the taxes were so high the man could not pay them; is it your idea, then, that this land should eventually go back to the State, and then as the people wanted it the State would sell it back to some one who desired to put it into actual use?

Mr. GEORGE. No, sir. If a landowner did not pay the tax, he would get sold out for taxes. Whoever bought would buy, subject to taxation.

Mr. RAKER. You do not quite get my question. Suppose the tax is so high that the man who owns the land can not pay it. Somebody else must take the land, must he not?

Mr. GEORGE. The owner simply lets go if he does not pay his tax.

Mr. RAKER. Who will get the title to the land when it is sold for taxes? The State will get it, will it not?

Mr. GEORGE. No; the buyer. Somebody will buy it if it has any value at all.

Mr. RAKER. I will make myself clear on the matter.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me make myself clear. I did not intend in this speech to go into these details, but it appears that I have got to go into some of them. The application of a single tax should not be a hundred per cent application. It should fall short just enough to leave enough value in the land untaxed to make a basis for sales. This basis for sales will become the market basis for valuation and taxation. Now, if a man, we will say, who is a speculator, a monopolist, or who is "land poor" can not or will not pay the tax imposed, he will have his land sold for taxes and he will lose it.

Mr. RAKER. Now, right there. Here is the point—

Mr. GEORGE. The land will go into the hands of a new man. That man will have to pay the tax. If the value of the land should fall, then the tax would correspondingly diminish. If the value should disappear, then there would be nothing to tax, and the owner would hold his land subject to no tax whatever. The hope of speculation gone, it is probable that there would be an abundance of free land open to whoever might wish to use it. Instead of having to go away out to the remote fastnesses of our mountains to find free land, we could then find free land accessible to our city populations, and some part of the people going out upon it, city congestion would be relieved.

Mr. RAKER. Now, for instance, in the State of California, all the public sales under taxation are to the State. There are no private sales in the first instance.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the Torrens system?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. Now, the point I wanted an answer to was this: When these sales are made to the State in the first instance, is it your intent and purpose, under this single-tax system, that the State then, in turn, after it gets the title, would sell it out to the public at the best price it could get for the man who wants to take it and actually use it?

Mr. GEORGE. The gentleman is asking me how the single tax would apply under the Torrens system. This Torrens system is an introduction from Australia or New Zealand, I have forgotten which. By it the government—in this instance Cali-

for a transfer guarantees the title. That is to say, in the transfer of land, the title must go through the hands of the government, which thereby guarantees the title. The application of the single tax would not change this. The present small tax on land values does not affect it. Why should a large tax? All I am proposing with respect to land is to increase the amount of the tax—now existing—now imposed on the ground, or what is at times called the "site" value of land.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from New York would break up the coal monopoly by taxing the land it owns in its mining enterprise. Suppose, instead of owning the land, it took a lease upon the land of other people, or of several other people, what effect would taxing the land have upon the monopoly in that instance?

Mr. GEORGE. It would fall upon the owner; and in the leasing of land, the man who took the land would take it subject to the taxation condition. I think that it is a very simple matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But there are several owners in this instance, and the mining corporation simply owns the personal property, which is not taxed at all.

Mr. GEORGE. The mining corporation, like any individual, should not be taxed on its personal property; as to the land, it should pay on its market, its real selling value. Idle land it would sell off; get rid of. It could not afford to pay taxes on valuable idle land.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am talking about leasing the land, and not owning land at all by the company.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I did not want to interrupt the gentleman, but I am interested very much in the gentleman's observations, and the purpose of the gentleman is, I think, exactly the purpose I would have in legislation. But what I want to ask is this question: We understand there is a vast carrying occupation in this country. All our coast-line vessels are engaged in transportation. Our railroads likewise are engaged in transportation. Now, I would like to know what solution there is in the gentleman's theory as to a monopoly of transportation, particularly on the ocean. What shipping line has to-day such a monopoly?

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

Mr. GEORGE. In the first place, the railroads have the most valuable kind of land. The terminals have a very great value. Besides, most railroads, especially the western railroads, have very valuable lands: Ore beds, oil deposits, timber tracts, water rights, agricultural lands, lands in and about cities. The taxation of land values would fall upon that. But as to railroads, I would go further, and this is beyond this taxation question. I would treat them as public highways. I think there is no getting away from doing that. The railroads must be taken into public hands as public highways, along with telegraphs and telephones and every function of a public highway. We must have them in our civilization. Yet it is impossible to have permanent competition in respect to them. Some individuals, getting the privilege to the exclusion of others to engage in the transportation business, will thereby get a serious advantage over others in the community. It therefore becomes a legitimate function of the State to perform.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me for one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; for a moment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman answered my question as to monopoly and water transportation. For instance, across the water the shipping company does not own the wharf, but the Government has made vast improvements in order to have a port. Now, there is a company organized that monopolizes the transportation from New York to Liverpool. Its property is all on the water. How would the gentleman's land tax affect that?

Mr. GEORGE. It would not affect it directly, assuming that the company itself owned no land; for instance, no wharf or warehouse privilege. But there would be a very material indirect effect. Removing taxation from steamships and steamship building would tend to beget competition. Opening idle lands of every kind to production would increase demand for

such shipping competition, and then beyond this, changing railroads from private administration to public administration would be of the greatest stimulus to competition; for now the railroads feed traffic to particular ocean carriers which they control.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; in a moment. To repeat to the gentleman from Texas, by taxing land values you would throw open the bounties of nature to all labor and increase the productive power of the country to such an extent as has never been witnessed in the United States. This would make a demand for vastly greater capacity for ocean carriage and feed competition.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, in my State, in my section of it, hundreds of thousands of acres of coal rights have been bought up by combinations of capital, and much of the coal can not possibly be taken out, perhaps, for generations yet to come. On the other hand, some of that coal is being taken out from time to time.

Now, the two estates in land are separable and are separated, the farmer owning the surface and all but the coal, which he has conveyed to the grantee. Is the grantee's estate there land, as you understand it, or not?

Mr. GEORGE. I should say that the whole earth is land, whether it be the surface or underneath, or altogether.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would you tax the coal right to the person or combination of persons who owned it?

Mr. GEORGE. I should.

Mr. GRAHAM. And so heavily that they could not afford to retain possession of it?

Mr. GEORGE. On its market value.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, they could not possibly use it for many years to come.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. GRAHAM. How would you make a distinction in that particular acreage from which they were then removing the coal from the other acreage from which they could not remove the coal for a long time?

Mr. GEORGE. You are asking me whether I should tax land that is at a disadvantage in production. I should, but not at the value of land having more advantage. That is, I should be governed by the one thing by which men are governed now, namely, the market price. If coal is actually underlying certain lands, but for one reason or another that coal can not be got out and mined, that land would have a distinctly low price in the market; whereas other land no richer in mineral, but more getatable, would have a high market price. I should assess the one kind of land low, the other high. I should place each piece of land on the tax list at its market value, and then tax that value.

Mr. GRAHAM. I realize that this point and many other points made by objectors or questioners are matters of detail and do not affect the general soundness of your theory, but in the case I mention what would your application of the theory be? Would you tax the coal which would not be mined for many years to come so heavily that those who have possessed themselves of hundreds of thousands of acres of it could not hold it?

Mr. GEORGE. I should if the assessment were based on the market price. I should discover what such lands would sell for. That is easily obtainable. To find just what that is is the business of people who buy and sell land, whether it be coal land, iron land, copper land, salt or other mineral land, farming land, urban or suburban land. Finding the market price, I should tax only that.

Mr. RAKER. I understand your application would be this: For instance, a man owned a good deal of coal land. You would tax it to the extent that he had to use it to make a profit out of it, and if he did not do that the land would be sold.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not pay any attention to whether he used it or not. I would tax it on its value. It is the owner's business to pay the tax and keep the land out of use or to use it.

Mr. RAKER. How would you make this application? That is a vital matter to our part of the country—

Mr. GEORGE. Let me finish my answer. My belief is that a man who pays a heavy tax upon idle land would very rapidly discover that too much of a burden. He would use the land or get rid of it.

Mr. RAKER. How would you make the application to timberland?

Mr. GEORGE. I would put timberland on the tax roll for the price that it would sell for. If it has good trees on it it would sell for such and such a price; if poor trees, a less price.

Do not men every day buy and sell timberlands? Take that price and tax the land on that.

Mr. RAKER. The owner can use but little of it as he goes along.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not matter whether he can use little or much. If he wants to monopolize it, he must pay the price. The price is the market price. Tax that.

THE CANONS OF TAXATION.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interrupted, and I want to make just a few connected observations before I close. I want to explain that I believe that this single tax would meet better than any other form of taxation the four canons of taxation. It is the most equal tax. It falls upon men according to the natural bounties they have in their possession. The man who has little pays little. The man who has much pays much, so that it is the most equal kind of a tax.

Then it is certain. It is not intermittent and wavering. It falls regularly, so that all dependent matters can be arranged accordingly.

In the next place, it is direct. It can not be shifted. It stays where it falls. There can be no addition of this tax to the value of the land. The landowners are getting as much as they can get now. They are not waiting for taxation to put up the price of their land. On the contrary, any proposal to put a tax on values immediately causes a discouragement on the part of some owners who have idle lands, and the tendency is for the price of land to go down. This tax can be seen. It is not the kind of a tax that falls and no man knoweth how much or where. There lies the land and there lies the value and there falls the tax.

And then it is the most economical tax in its incidence. It lays no burden beyond the revenue received from it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is cheaper in the collection.

Mr. GEORGE. As the gentleman from Illinois says, it is cheaper in the collection. This tax is not like a tariff tax. That falls upon things coming into the country. To the extent of the tax and the volume of the things so imported is the revenue that goes into the Public Treasury. But the tax on imports enables an increase in the price of similar commodities made in this country. There is not a cent of revenue from this home production. In the case of the tax on land values, the more the tax the less the speculation, and, therefore, the lower the price of land. So that in application, it is the most economical of all taxes.

THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL QUESTIONS.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not stop with the canons of taxation; for that, after all is said, is a fiscal question. I want to direct attention further. It relates to the great industrial questions of our country. This land tax does not mean merely a better way of raising revenue, a more economical way, a more direct way, a more just way. It means far more than that. It means the opening to the use of labor and capital the vast quantities of land now shut off by speculation.

There is no real scarcity of land anywhere. There is no scarcity even in the city of New York with its great population. With all its great tenements, with all its swarming humanity—and within certain blocks there are four and five thousand beings—I say that with all that congestion, the most concentrated population on the globe, it has been computed that there is land enough inside the corporate limits of the city to give to every head of family from one-eighth to one-quarter of an acre of good ground. I am not proposing to divide the land. I am explaining that there is no such thing as a scarcity of land there. There is land enough, but most of it is held out of use. Great areas are vacant on the outskirts, and you can go along Broadway and Fifth Avenue, the greatest and proudest of thoroughfares on the whole hemisphere, and find vacant lots, and one and two story shacks and shanties where there ought to be imperial buildings.

Why is this? Because the penalty of holding land out of use is so slight that men can pay the small tax and yet, owing to social growth and social improvement, and the consequent increase in value, realize handsome profits by the speculation. Some men acquire fortunes in a short time by simply getting hold of a piece of land, sitting down, and letting society do the rest.

This is so in every State; it is so in every village, town, and hamlet of our country. It is so throughout the agricultural regions, it is so throughout the mineral and timber regions. There is plenty of land, but few owners. Apply this tax and you tax out the speculators, you tax in the users, you produce a new order in the United States.

We, of all the peoples of the world, ought to be the most advanced. We have drawn from the nations of the earth their

best in brawn, their best in heart and hope; not the old, not the diseased, but the young, plastic with youth, ready to mold themselves into our conditions. They have poured in, as to the land of promise, their many bloods and produced the richest mingling that ever gave the life fluid to a new country. Soon we shall number a hundred millions, scattered over a vast territory more varied in soils and climate than has ever before been the heritage of a nation, welded into a homogeneous whole, with one language, one body of institutions, one code of laws, one democratic form of government. We ought to be the greatest people, because we have the greatest possible opportunities. But what are we doing to rise to these opportunities? We have instituted a condition by which a few own the country. A few here, a few there, practically control villages, towns, cities, counties, and almost whole States. We have a landlordism greater than anything conceived in Great Britain or Germany or in the Orient. We have the greatest landlords that have ever been seen. Should we meet this condition, should we apply taxation to land values so as to break down land monopoly and throw open the soil of our country to our fast-growing population, a prosperity will come such as will dumbfound mankind and give to America the glory of carrying civilization to a point higher than ever reached in the destinies of the race. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I wish first to express the pleasure with which we have all listened to the exposition of the single-tax system by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE], and I might add with what profit we have all listened to the discussion of the question with respect to the tariff or no tariff on wool, and on previous days with what enlightenment and illumination the people of the country received the speeches on reciprocity, for and against. As a slight indication, Mr. Chairman, however, as to what the great commercial world is thinking of the assembling of this body and its work to this time, with the permission of the House I will read a letter I received to-day from B. W. Army & Son, manufacturers of oak leather belting, Trenton Avenue and Somerset Street, Philadelphia. It is as follows:

JUNE 8, 1911.

Hon. BENJAMIN K. FOCHT, Washington, D. C.:

We thank you for your consideration in sending us a copy of your speech concerning the extension of American commerce through the facilities offered by the Department of State, and we have read this address with considerable interest, believing that these facilities thus freely offered should contribute much to the extension of our foreign commerce. Permit us, however, in connection with this subject of commerce to suggest that the best thing that the Congress can do at this time for the advantage of American commerce is to adjourn and go home.

[Applause and laughter.]

All industrial trade in this country is paralyzed. Thousands of men, either partially or wholly idle, are walking the streets, and factories are closed or working on short time, whilst the several members of the Government, from the President down to both Houses, are spending the passing moment in a wild endeavor to secure a reelection to the particular office which he or they may be holding. Whilst there are other causes that are contributing to this tremendous paralysis of industrial operation, the one great cause, overshadowing all others, is the blight of the Congress in an active and unnecessary session. If you are interested in industrialism, as your speech would indicate, there is no better field for your energy and your eloquence than in urging an immediate adjournment.

Yours, truly,

C. W. ARMY & SON.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address my remarks mainly to the unjust distribution of the tariff burden, and I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] who has just taken his seat that this side of the House does not propose to go home until it shows the people of this country that we are going to relieve them of those unjust burdens. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman, that if that is the case, and your free-trade theories are put in operation, when you go home, you will never come back. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. We will take the chances on that. Your prospects of getting back is much worse than that of the Democratic side, from the experience you had in the last election.

Mr. FOCHT. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is speaking of some absent brethren, and not myself.

Mr. TRIBBLE. As usual, when the tariff is being revised the country is threatened with destruction, unless the eastern manufacturer is permitted to enact a tariff suited to his ideas of legitimately fleecing the people with the Government's stamp of approval on his greed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I charge no personal dishonesty to his methods. I grant you the system of protection has become almost a fixture under Republican rule of many years and has become almost a part of

our national life. Though oppressive to the poor—the wage earner, the farmer, and the great mass of people—though dangerous to our liberties and future prosperity, still the system can not with safety to our great national demands be stricken down with one stroke of the pen.

The wool schedule has furnished the field on which many battles have been fought. I have no desire to retard the prosperity of any section of this Union; I have no desire to tear down any manufacturing enterprise in any part of this Union; but, sir, for one I will not stand for a policy that deprives the great mass of people of the comforts of warmth in this rigorous climate in order to protect the giant wool manufacturing companies in their unreasonable demands to exclude foreign woolen goods from this country so that they may force the American people to pay their trust prices for blankets and other comforts from wool products. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The policy of Republican protection has already placed the wealth of this country in the hands of a few men and corporations. It is astounding to know that 90 per cent of the property of this country is owned by 1 per cent of the families. This condition has grown up under your infamous protected system. You have fostered combinations and trusts until the trusts actually demand control of legislation instead of submitting to legislative control. All Americans must concede that we are facing a dangerous crisis in the history of this Government. When the trusts are threatened with extermination they openly defy you and threaten to destroy the prosperity of the country by precipitating panics and depressing business, and many people fear their threats. If they have grown so bold and strong as to cause alarm when they are pursued, then I call on every Representative in this House to be a party to striking a blow that their power may cease to grow stronger.

You have pretended all of these years in political campaigns and in your literature that your protected-policy system was for the purpose of shielding infant industries. This doctrine was promulgated by the great apostle of protection, Henry Clay.

Instead of pursuing this policy in legislation you have protected the manufacturers of the East, the weavers of fine goods and fabrics; you have permitted them to juggle with the tariff regulations, and often placed both specific and ad valorem duties on such goods as they select, until you have driven foreign trade from our shores in many classes of goods, and you have almost driven American vessels from the seas. Instead of protecting infant manufactories, as you pretended to the people, you have protected the ancient mills. The manufactories that have been under the wing of your protecting care have grown out of their swaddling long years ago and have become giant corporations and trusts hoary with age. You preached protection of infant industries all these years, and yet the southern mills, many in their infancy, making coarse goods and yarns are discriminated against. Every page of the Payne-Aldrich tariff shows the hand of the eastern mills making specific taxes suited to the peculiar needs of the various fabrics manufactured by them. You have built around this country a tariff wall, placing the power of wealth in the hands of a few men, thus dwarfing the power of the common people. In the season of prosperity through which we have been passing the poor, instead of bettering their condition, have grown poorer, thus exemplifying the annunciation of our Master that "unto him that hath it shall be given and to him that hath not it shall be taken away, even that which he hath."

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party will support this bill, and the people will approve our action in so doing. It is in keeping with our pledges to the people. It may not come up to the perfect ideal of many of us, but still it appeals to everyone as a business measure progressing along lines of a wise policy. It is not radical. It carries out the doctrine of gradual reduction promulgated by the Democratic Party. The Democratic hosts all over the country are calling for gradual business reduction of the tariff, keeping an eye on the National Treasury at the same time. I desire to say, explanatory of my personal position, the reduction on wool and woolen goods falls short of what I would have made it had I drawn the bill.

It should not be forgotten, however, that in detail work on a great measure like this, where there are 227 individual minds, concessions must be made with no sacrifice of party principles. I favor this bill because I feel I am helping my people this much to secure the comforts of life with less money. It can not be truthfully claimed that the bill does violence to the wool and woolen industries that have grown up under the protective-tariff system. Is it right to put farm products on the free list and reach out a helping hand to the wool manufacturers? The Democratic Party is opposed to protective tariff on both raw material and manufactured goods. The platform of the party commissioned us to reduce the tariff gradually. In the

Sixty-first Congress the Republicans bore a commission to revise the tariff downward. Instead of being faithful to their trust, that party revised the tariff and shot it upward. Then the people shot them outward. [Applause.] In consequence the Republican Party has been almost demolished. Shall we stand by our party mandates and give the people material and gradual reduction, or shall we ignore the platform of the party? From the day of Adam to the present time disobedience has been disastrous. The children of Israel, on account of disobedience to the law of God, wandered in the wilderness 38 years. Party platform is my master, and I am its servant. We have elected our leaders, and if these leaders, in drafting the bill, follow the party mandates, and the caucus of the party so decide, then I shall support the bill. I am not going off after strange doctrines. The old Democratic doctrine is good enough for me. Our sojourn in the wilderness for 16 years in pursuit of strange theories is long enough for me. Personally I have faith in the gentleman from Alabama, the leader on this side of the House. My faith is so strong in his honesty, his wisdom, and his statesmanship that I believe his name will be written on the pages of history as one of the greatest statesmen of this era, and though he lives in forbidden territory of the South, still I hope to see him elected President of these United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You can not jump from one extreme to another without paralyzing the business of the Nation. The country is confronted with a condition; we are legislating to meet the pressing demands of that condition. The condition we confront was thrust upon us by long years of Republican rule. Many of us would like to see free wool, but do the conditions authorize it? The committee, after long deliberations and thorough investigation, answers no, and the caucus of the Democratic Party, after careful study, has adopted that view; and I feel that the Democratic Party in this House should rally unanimously to the party action. The bill reduces both raw wool and manufactured goods alike. The thing of most interest to my people in the formation of this legislation is the finished manufactured goods. They wear the finished goods in clothing and protect themselves from cold with the manufactured goods.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to demonstrate the real facts by comparing this bill with the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and by actual calculations show the difference as they affect the great mass of people. These illustrations will show that the poor people pay much more duty on the goods they use of the same class than the rich man pays for the goods he uses. First, I will demonstrate the truth of this assertion by pointing out the duty on different grades of alpaca. The cheap grades are used by those less able to pay the high prices, and the higher grades are used by the wealthy class. Paragraph 380 provides that dress goods and linings, when composed of wool in the warp and cotton in the weft, weighing less than 4 ounces to the square yard and costing less than 15 cents per square yard and less than 70 cents per pound, shall pay a duty of 7 cents per square yard and 50 cents ad valorem; costing more than 15 cents per square yard and more than 70 cents per pound shall pay 8 cents per square yard and 55 cents ad valorem. Take a piece of alpaca costing 10 cents per yard: The specific duty is 7 cents, ad valorem 5 cents, combined duty 12 cents. Divide the 12 by 10, the price of the goods, this will give you 120 per cent on the cheap goods. Take the real alpaca, at 40 cents per yard: Specific duty 8 cents, ad valorem duty 22 cents, combined duty 30 cents. Divide the combined duty by 40, the price of the goods, this gives you 75 per cent duty. This shows you 45 per cent more on the cheap goods.

Price 10 cents per yard:	Cents.
Specific duty.....	7
Ad valorem duty.....	5
Combined duty.....	12
12÷10=120 per cent.	
Price 40 cents per yard:	
Specific duty.....	8
Ad valorem duty.....	22
Combined duty.....	30
30÷40=75 per cent.	

In reading the section you naturally gather the idea that the high-class goods carry more duty. Notice 12 cents combined duty on cheap alpaca and 22 combined duty on high alpaca, but the investigation should not stop there; dividing the price of the goods by the duty which obtains gives proper results. This may sound commonplace to some broad-minded statesman on the floor of this House, but I am attempting to explain this iniquitous tariff and make it so clear that the little boys of the whole country may understand the deception in the wording of many Republican tariff schedules.

Furthermore, I desire to give a practical application of the Payne bill, and will ask you to go with me into a mercantile establishment and we will be spectators in the sales. Two women walk up to the counter; one is a poor woman; she brings the daily earnings of her husband, and not being able to buy high-class goods she calls for 10-cent alpaca. The other woman standing near her, having a large bank account and able to pay, calls for 40-cent alpaca. We, the spectators of the trade, see the poor woman pass over the counter 45 per cent more per yard on her purchase than the woman of wealth. How can you face your constituents and ask their support with such an infamous tariff record as this? My illustrations and old-field schoolhouse calculations may not appeal to the fastidious as polished oratory, but I am appealing to common sense.

Mr. ADAIR. The illustrations reach home.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I hope they will.

Second illustration: Section 378 of the Payne bill—knit fabrics, and so forth, weighing 12 ounces per yard and costing 50 cents per yard, pay a duty of 44 cents per pound, specific, and 50 per cent ad valorem. First illustrate with 50 cents per yard: The specific duty on this is 33 cents; ad valorem duty, 25 cents; combined duty, 58 cents. Dividing this by 50, the cost price, gives you 116 per cent duty.

Next, take a yard costing \$1: The specific duty would be 33 cents; ad valorem duty, 55 cents; combined duty, 88 cents. Dividing this by \$1 gives 88 per cent duty. Go through the same process with 1 yard costing \$1.50: Specific duty, 33 cents; ad valorem duty, 62½ cents; combined duty, 95½ cents. Divide this by \$1.50; this will give you 63½ per cent.

In passing from the 50 cents per yard to \$1.50 per yard the duty is 54 cents less on the high-class goods.

Price 50 cents per yard:	Cents.
Specific duty	33
Ad valorem duty	25
Combined duty	58
58 ÷ 50 = 116 per cent.	
Price \$1 per yard:	
Specific duty	33
Ad valorem duty	55
Combined duty	88
88 ÷ 1 = 88 per cent.	
Price \$1.50 per yard:	
Specific duty	33
Ad valorem duty	62½
Combined duty	95½
95½ ÷ 1.50 = 63½ per cent.	

In summing up these illustrations and making the same estimates on the same class of goods contained in the Democratic measure now before the House you will see the average reduction in section 380 is 65 per cent, and on section 378 the average reduction is 76 per cent. It is a mystery how the Republican Party has had the face to stand before the common people of this land, seeking their support, with such an iniquitous tariff bill on the books.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. I understood the gentleman a moment ago to say that he did not believe in using harsh language.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose one of your Georgia farmers was held up in the road and his money taken away from him; what would you call that in Georgia?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I would call that robbery. Do you think that is the way the Republican Party has been doing on the tariff question—just robbing the people?

Mr. RAKER. From the gentleman's argument, that is what I would gather he is trying to convince the public.

Mr. TRIBBLE. All right; I am giving the public facts. Reciprocity with Canada, the farmers' free list, and the woolen schedule discriminate against no section or State—they are uniform. The farmers' free list not only benefits the farmers, but it carries its blessings into the homes of 35,000,000 people who own no homes. There are millions upon millions of our citizens whose daily earnings go for food, clothing, and rent. These have been paying tribute not only to the millionaire trusts, but the Republican tariff policies force the burdens of the Government's tax upon them, the people least able to bear it.

It is estimated that the wealth of this country, being owned by a few men and corporations, pays only one-twelfth of the tax necessary to support the Government, while the people who own a little or no property pay eleven-twelfths, therefore the poor of the country pay the taxes when, as a matter of justice, wealth should bear its part and not make taxes the poor man's burden.

We have promised the people to reduce the tariff on the necessities of life, and let us not be sidetracked by this vociferous call from certain sources for more pensions. I would remind you that increased debt and reduction of tariff are not companions. One is the call of the people, the other a protectionist's snare.

Should the taxes be raised by direct taxation and all tariff duties removed, you would hear the greatest howl ever raised in this country, coming from the trust and corporations and men of wealth against government extravagance. I am not favoring this method of tax, but only illustrating in this way. Then you would hear no more of pensions on the floor of this House. As it is now, the interests are delighted with extravagance—pensions and other forms of appropriations. The delight of their lives is to hear of a deficit in the Treasury, for this means the continuation of the tariff laws and the handing over to them of more protective bouquets, thus perpetuating their infamous system.

As a matter of truth the great mass of American people—North, East, South, and West—do not want an increased pension debt. It is the interested pensioner, holding the balance of power in many States, backed by the manufacturing trusts, who would deplete the Treasury for selfish political purposes. The tax-burdened citizen can not understand why pension rolls continue to increase, although the Civil War ended 46 years ago.

Some gentlemen on this floor have seen fit to refer to the apparent solicitude of the House for the farmers. This was said in levity, no doubt, but, sir, it is time for every man in this House to turn his attention to farm prosperity. The farmer produces the wealth of the Nation; he carries its burdens on his shoulders; in time of war the ring of his hammer is heard no more on the peaceful highways of his home; his plowshare stands in the field where first he heard the bugle call; he answered that call; has gone to the front; and bivouacs on the field of battle. God forbid that I should mention his name on the floor of this House except with proper deference. Often he labors himself upon the farm, but he is the man for a' that. Often his clothes are soiled with honest toil, but he is the man for a' that. He seeks no graft, he forms no trusts, but he is the backbone of this country, and I warn both sides of this House that the time has come when the farmer will be heard in his reasonable demands. On national questions he is the best-informed man of the land, and is tired of political harangue. He has seen with sinking heart the wealth of the country absorbed by a few men. He knows the Republican Party is responsible, and he knows that party is joined to its idols—the trusts and the corporate interests. He knows this condition imperils the liberties of his children and threatens the foundation of our national life, therefore the great army of farmers has turned from that party in mass and look to the rising sun of Democracy with hope, demanding rational business methods in the government of this Republic. The cry of depression and panics resulting from Democratic rule is the cry of fanaticism. Already the trusts are on the retreat; the hand of the avenger is upon them. It is apparent to all the country that the Democratic Party is dealing cautiously with the tariff question. There is not a man in the House more anxious than I to give the people an honest reduction on the necessities of life, but, sir, I see danger in depleting the Treasury of the necessary amount to run the Government economically. If the Democratic Party pursues the course of reducing tariff on revenue articles and thus depletes the Treasury without providing revenue to take the place from some source, then the party will make a serious mistake. Sad experience in the past has taught well this lesson, and in passing the Canadian reciprocity, the farmers' free list, and in the formation of this bill the committee has kept an eye on the Treasury. We did not make the debt for which we are called upon to supply the revenue to pay.

Permit me to point to other iniquities of the Republican tariff which we have removed in the Democratic measure. The Payne-Aldrich bill placed the burden on the necessities and not the luxuries.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. A few moments ago you suggested your sympathy in behalf of the farmers and you now express yourself as being in favor of reducing the cost of living.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Now, that seems a little inconsistent to me. I thought the farmers depend for their prosperity upon the price of the things that go into the cost of living.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I desire to answer the gentleman's questions in full, and I am glad he mentioned this, and I will show you

what the Republican Party has done and what the Democratic Party has done for agriculture. The Democratic Party has proceeded to relieve the farmer on farm implements. The impression has been all over the country that many of these articles from which the Democratic Party has removed the tariff were revenue articles. That is a wrong impression. These implements have been sold in foreign countries—made in the United States—cheaper than they could be bought right here at our door. Take barb wire, for instance. Barb wire is an expensive article, used on the farm, and the farmers must have this wire. The farmers in Europe buy the American barb wire cheaper than the American farmer. The Republican Party can not hide behind the old cry of "The Government must raise revenue," because barb wire produces no revenue. It is excluded. The same is true of nearly all the other farm implements, or any other article that is excluded from this country by the tariff wall. I will say to the gentleman, the facts are against your party. Your protective tariff system was never intended to help the farmer. It was inaugurated to help the manufacturers; now it has become the citadel of trusts, and this talk of protective tariff for farmers is nothing less than a Republican snare and deception to try to deceive the farmer; but you can not deceive him with that argument.

The policy of protection has been to place high duty on the things the farmer is forced to buy and give the protected interest a lever to fluctuate the price of farm products at will. How can the farmer receive his well-earned profits at the end of the year if he is forced by the trusts, through the protective-tariff system, to pay trust prices for the necessary demands to make his crop and furnish his family with the necessities of life? He pays trust prices for farm implements, personal effects, commercial fertilizers, and almost everything not produced on the farm. He pays his tribute to the trusts, his arch enemy, almost every time he makes a purchase. Tell me I should not cry out against such discrimination! You only add to my zeal and determination to help, if possible, that class of our Commonwealth. The farmers' free list places nearly all farm implements free of duty, and this takes almost no revenue from the Government, the whole amount of revenue raised from agricultural implements for the year 1910 being only \$12,189. Another strong illustration of discrimination against the farmer is cotton bagging and ties. The country has been misled with the doctrine that bagging and ties are revenue-producing articles. As a matter of truth the combined duty does not reach \$100,000 annually. Thus you see all farm implements, bagging and ties, and various other articles I could enumerate now in the free list do not produce enough revenue to be considered a drop in the bucket compared with the great amount of revenue to be raised. In passing, notice the discrimination. The western farmer wraps his hay with free twine, while cotton ties bear duty. So the country concludes that the farmer is discriminated against, and, furthermore, that blind prejudice has discriminated against the South in order that the protected industries might reap an unjust harvest from the tolling masses in every cotton district in the South. Another illustration in the present free list is the sewing machine, an article of common use in nearly every home in the land. The people in purchasing the sewing machine have paid a tribute of \$5 to \$10 on every machine to the trust, while the same trust sold foreigners American-made machines from \$5 to \$10 less than our citizens could buy them. It is unreasonable to suppose that when all the oppression of the Republican tariff is fully exposed and understood that this party of the trust can ever thrive again on the American continent, unless it adopts a different policy and ceases to discriminate against the poor of the land. It is a well-known fact that the trust is the favored child of the Republican Party, and now that we Democrats have control, let us set upon and destroy the power of the trust lest he turn again and rend us.

Mr. SLOAN. Speaking of the conditions of the last 16 years, what other profession or calling ever existed in this country that has increased in its wealth, both in volume and relatively more, than the farmers of the United States in spite of what has taken place?

Mr. TRIBBLE. In spite of the tariff that has been placed upon them and discriminations which have been made against them they have prospered. I will come to that just a little later.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the gentleman from Georgia think that the American farmer will be better off when he is buying imported implements made in foreign countries than when buying implements made at home?

Mr. TRIBBLE. We do not have to buy imported implements when we can get them here at reasonable prices with protection removed. We should get them at the same price the foreigner gets them. Certainly American-produced articles should not be sold in foreign countries for less money than our farmers pay for the same articles.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was not the object of the Democratic Party in reducing the tariff to enable the farmer to get imported implements?

Mr. TRIBBLE. No, sir; you would not give your farmers at your door an opportunity to buy a plow that he used every day at the same price sold to foreigners, and yet it was made at your door, and still you ask that farmers support you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I would not criticize the majority of the committee in forming tariff bills for the consideration of this House; they are Democrats of many years experience in tariff investigations and legislation; but I regret that in their wisdom they are not prepared to give the country reduction on certain other articles of necessity at the present time. For instance, from all over the country comes the appeal for reduction of the tariff on sugar. In justice to the committee, however, it is right that the attention of the country be called to the fact that nearly \$60,000,000 of revenue tax is raised annually from this source. The country is assured by the committee that not only sugar, but hundreds of other articles will be revised downward as soon as luxuries can be supplied in a business way to take the place of sugar and other revenue-producing articles.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Those schedules will be considered and acted upon in the regular order as they come up before the committee, and as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SLOAN. How about rice?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I have especially in mind sugar. Under Republican tariff I read you a list that will not sound good to the great mass of American people:

	Per cent.
Sugar duty	78.87
Champagne	70
Automobiles	45
Furs	50
Rare paintings and statuary	15
Diamonds	10

Diamond duty, 10 per cent. Sugar duty, 78. This shows in the true light the Republican theory of government. Are you surprised that this party faced defeat in almost every State in the Union? How many people buy diamonds? Every household buys sugar and pays about 35 cents duty on every dollar's worth.

The Democratic Party will be true to its promises and inaugurate reform in Government expenditures, thus reducing the necessity of so much tariff. This is a prolific field of investigation to save the people's money. The following is the language of Gen. W. W. Wotherspoon in a naval hearing of a recent date. He said:

I am perfectly convinced that an army three times as efficient and probably twice as strong as we have now can be maintained for the money we are at present spending for the Army.

Investigations show lack of system. It has been charged freely on the floor of the House that over two hundred millions can be saved annually by application of business methods and economy. If this be true, revenue duties of the sugar class would not be needed by the Government. I believe the effectiveness of the Army and Navy can be increased on one-half the appropriation. This alone would mean a saving of one hundred and fifteen millions of the money of a tax-burdened people every year. My statement may appear an exaggeration, but, sir, I speak the words of soberness and truth. It is estimated that there is one employee of this Government for every 17 votes cast in the last presidential election. This does not include the Army and Navy. The people pay the price, and I am here representing the people protesting against this price.

Much is claimed for protection that the system did not do. The claim of the ex-Speaker that the protective tariff caused the recent prosperity in the South is absurd, and his attempt to credit the Republican Party and protective tariff with the increase of wealth from sixteen billions to one hundred and twenty-five billions since 1856 is also absurd. Is nothing due to the development of our resources, agricultural, mineral, and manufacturing? Is nothing due to the American manhood?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to make an explanation. I think you do not want to do the ex-Speaker an injustice.

Mr. TRIBBLE. By no means.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. His speech did not have anything to do with the tariff. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRANTLEY], I think it was, who was talking, spoke of the increased wealth

of this country from 1850 to 1860, and the ex-Speaker referred to what it had been from that time on to the present time, and said nothing about tariff having anything to do with it.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I think if you will investigate the RECORD and read Mr. BRANTLEY's argument, and the question of the ex-Speaker, you will conclude he intended to give Republican tariff bills this credit. He certainly gave the tariff the credit for the prosperity in the South. Read his Canadian reciprocity speech, that part where his reminiscences carried him back to his boyhood home in the Carolinas. I say to you that the South has prospered notwithstanding the heavy arm of tariff oppression and discrimination against that section all these years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Do you say that under the present policy of a majority of the House they are getting even as fast as they can, and the discrimination is going the other way?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I would like the gentleman to point out any discrimination coming our way. Indeed, I did not say that the discrimination was now in the South's favor.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion I will say that it is natural in addressing this House on proposed legislation for our hearts, our minds, and our sympathies to reach out for the people of our own districts. Oh, that Members could rise to the magnitude of statesmen and see not only their own districts, but the whole country, with a vision of justice.

Mr. RAKER. I was going to ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: It was stated the other day on the floor of this House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in regard to the South, that its hills were barren and practically worthless and useless.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes, sir; I am glad to answer that question. I desire to say in reply to the question you propound to me that there is no section in this Union more fertile than the Southern States. The Secretary of Agriculture said in a great speech in Atlanta about three months ago—and he is a great man and has done a great work for the Southern States—that the South is a marvelous country. Think of it, 100 boys in the South on 100 acres of land produced an average of 133 bushels of corn per acre. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SLOAN. And the Republicans will probably increase their votes by about a hundred, will they not?

Mr. TRIBBLE. In further answer to the question propounded to me by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] I will say, if you will investigate and look into the Yearbook, I think it is, or some of the agricultural publications recently issued by this Government, you will find a picture of a boy 10 miles from my home standing at the very head of corn production in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is in the South.

Now, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who made the statement in regard to the South, that the South will not only in a few years add a billion dollars to her wealth every year from her cotton crop, but your constituents from the State of Pennsylvania will be coming down to the South, like the sons of Jacob into Egypt, to buy corn. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENSLEY. And they will vote the Democratic ticket when they get there. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. What explanation does the gentleman give to this question: The gentleman says his people are going to improve in the South in the future; what is his explanation of the fact that they have not improved and increased in wealth in the past as rapidly as other sections?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes, sir; I will answer that question with great pleasure. In the year 1865 the smoke from burning homes and wrecks of fortunes could be seen on every hilltop and valley of the South. One-half a century looks back on our struggle to regain our position in this Union. Year after year, from poverty-stricken homes where the wolf howled around the door in the years following the war, thousands, millions, and yea billions of dollars have flowed into the North, the East, and West in the form of pensions for Union soldiers. I will say to the gentleman from California that not one dollar of that money has ever found its way back to the South. And not only that, but in the years following the war the tide of immigration seeking homes to develop from the North and East westward took its flight on account of the negro in our midst. And now, sir, facing the conditions that I have mentioned and bearing the pensions of our own Confederate survivors upon

our shoulders, and bearing the burdens of discriminating tariff placed upon us by the Republican Party, is it any wonder that the progress of the South has been slow?

Slowly but surely we have climbed the hills of prosperity, gaining steadfast footing at every step, mounting up at last to where we can see, thank God, the rising sun of prosperity, unequaled in the history of the world, bursting upon the South. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield an hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FRANCIS]. [Applause.]

Mr. FRANCIS. Mr. Chairman, I feel a hesitancy to discuss a proposition which has received the attention of the best minds of our country for the past 100 years. And a schedule now formed and recommended by such a high, honorable, and painstaking body of men as our Ways and Means Committee. Great credit is due them for their untiring effort to relieve the people. To preserve the great sheep industry of the country, on the one hand, and to keep and maintain the great woolen manufacturing industry of the country, on the other hand. This is a profound business proposition, and not a scheme of jugglery which Republican politics has tried to play since 1867; attempting to keep two balls in the air at the same time without letting either fall to the ground. It is to the manner of accomplishing and doing equal and exact justice to all that I shall particularly direct my remarks. We are dealing with a question which concerns 92,000,000 of people in the supply of the necessities of life, in their clothing and foodstuffs, largely supplied from the sheep-folds of the United States. A business in which every State in the Union is interested is the business of sheep raising, and in which business thousands of persons are engaged—in the occupation of woolgrowing and in the production of mutton. A business in which 1,213 mills are engaged and interested in producing clothes for our people and in giving employment to thousands of persons as wage earners; an industry in which the sheep of the United States number 58,000,000, valued at \$235,000,000.

Out of this vast industry we are attempting to raise a certain amount of revenue for the support of the Government, and by doing so are exercising one of the great and serious powers of government—the taxing power—or, rather, attempting to untax the people in one respect and tax them in another, so as to equalize the burdens which they are required to bear.

When we consider that the reckless expenditures for governmental purposes made by the Sixtieth Congress placed upon each individual of this Republic approximately \$13 per person—and the Sixty-first Congress did very little better—which have to be raised in the main by tariff duties, we little wonder that the ballots of the voters have changed the political complexion of this House. This enormous sum was levied upon the necessities of life. Money can not be picked up from cobblestones nor does it grow on trees, but comes from the people and as a tax upon the necessities of life. In this we find the secret of the high cost of living.

What Member of the Sixtieth or Sixty-first Congress would care to go back to his district and tell his dear constituents that he had just voted upon his district and upon them \$2,500,000 for a single Congress? Yet that is just what was done. Or who would care to say to one of his counties of 50,000 people, "We have placed upon your county \$650,000 which your people must pay by indirect taxation"? Who would dare to submit to his county the proposition that they should vote upon such a county for the expense of government \$650,000? I dare say there would not be enough votes cast for the proposition to be worth counting.

But this is the subtle policy of our Government, and has been since its foundation, to raise the necessary expenses of government by tariff duties; and it is a fact that the great sheep and woolen industries of our country have produced revenue for this purpose in the past two years second to none but sugar.

I want my position to be understood early in this discussion.

First. This bill is framed ostensibly on a revenue basis, and, to some extent, that for every cent which is levied upon raw wool or woolen goods entering our ports to that extent it increases or lowers the price of wool or woolen goods, as the case may be, and relieves the people to that extent from the high cost of manufactured goods.

Now, is this true? Upon the adoption of Schedule K the American Woolen Co. advances its price on all manufactured goods 36 per cent. Not only this, but that company, by some means, just about the same time of the adoption of this schedule, began manufacturing what they call an all-wool cloth, largely out of cotton and shoddy. They evidently, in order to produce such cloth as they have been selling and supplying to the people, have crossed a shoddy ram with a cotton jenny. [Applause.]

Shortly after the adoption of Schedule K it announced a price for XX Ohio raw wool of from 27 to 30 cents per pound. This wool had formerly been selling at a price ranging from 35 to 38 cents per pound; so it is readily seen that all legislation on wool tariff fails to reduce or enhance the price where there is an intervening power that can and does absolutely fix prices. Imagine a concern combining some 34 separate institutions or plants, comprising some 150 mills, at an aggregate ostensible capital of \$69,000,000—an octopus, the product of which, in the form of Schedule K, is placed upon the back of every man, woman, and child in the United States—organized to rob and prey upon the people, organized to control prices and to buy the raw wool from our people at such prices as they see fit, organized to control the price and conditions of labor in its numerous factories.

The Democratic Party is unalterably opposed to trusts in any form and opposed to high protection in their interest.

And now do we wish to aid this gigantic trust by giving it practically free raw material with which it can carry on its scheme of exploitation and robbery?

I for one do not believe in placing within the power of this trust practically free raw wool or in enacting a tariff law of such low schedule that it can go to my constituents and to all the woolgrowers throughout the country, as it will do, and say to them, the tariff is reduced and consequently we can not pay you but 18 or 20 cents per pound for your wool; and this thing it is sure to do.

This gigantic corporation controls more than 31 per cent of the woolen goods manufactured in this country and practically all of the worsted goods made here. Representing, as I have said, an ostensible capital of \$69,000,000, organized in the year 1899 by combining the following mills:

Anchor Mills, Pascoag, R. I.; Anderson Mills, Scowhegan, Me.; Assabet Mills, Maynard, Mass.; Baltic Mills, Enfield, N. H.; Bay State Mills, Lowell, Mass.; Beaver Brook Mills, Lowell, Mass.; Beoli Mills, Fitchburg, Mass.; Brown Mills, Dover, Me.; Chase Mills, Webster, Mass.; Fitchburg Mills, Fitchburg, Mass.; Fulton Mills, Fulton, N. Y.; Hecla Mills, Uxbridge, Mass.; Kennebec Mills, Fairfield, Me.; Lebanon Mills, Lebanon, N. H.; Manton Mills, Manton, R. I.; Moosup Mills, Moosup, Conn.; National and Providence Worsted Mills, Providence, R. I.; Prospect Mills, Lawrence, Mass.; Puritan Mills, Plymouth, Mass.; Rau Mills, Franklin, Mass.; Roverside Mills, Providence, R. I.; Saranac Mills, Blackstone, Mass.; Sawyer Mills, Dover, N. H.; Valley Mills, Providence, R. I.; Vassalboro Mills, North Vassalboro, Me.; Washington Mills, Lawrence, Mass.; and Weybosset Mills, Providence, R. I.

No one will believe for a moment that these mills were ever worth one-fifth of \$69,000,000; but the directors and officials of these corporations were evidently called together and had a meeting, and those financial sharks were present who knew so well how to create something out of nothing, and began to put prices on their several works. No. 1 would say, "Our plant is worth a million dollars," when, in fact, the whole thing, bag and baggage, was not worth over \$250,000. And so they passed it down the line, Nos. 2, 3, and 4, until they took in 28 of such works. How easy it is for persons to deal with each other in this way. They buy their own property and sell to themselves, and to them the most pleasant thing in the world is to sell for five or seven times more than their mill is worth.

Quoting from a statement of William M. Wood, president of this gigantic octopus, after speaking of the vast combination I have described, he says:

"With such a combination of mills and capital it has been able to effect many economic improvements in manufacture not otherwise possible. The company produces a large amount of goods suitable for all classes—60,000 different fabrics and styles are shown each year. The company buys direct its own raw material; it spins its own yarn, weaves its own cloth, and maintains one of the most expensive organizations in the world for the disposal of its fabrics direct."

And here let me state that these fabrics are sold to their jobbers at a fixed price, and by an ironclad agreement, below which no merchant dare to sell the same or cut the price. If he does, he is no longer a customer of the American Woolen Co., as he would not be permitted to receive or handle their goods.

This same William M. Wood, when speaking before the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, February 1, 1911, in this city, said:

"Schedule K, much maligned, much misunderstood, if properly understood would be the most appreciated of any schedule in the tariff; and if all schedules in the tariff were so scientifically based and as well poised and balanced as Schedule K it would be the most remarkable document next to the Constitution of the United States that the human mind has ever produced. Schedule K protects labor in the woolen and worsted mills of the country."

Now, gentlemen, you see what this great beneficiary of Schedule K, who has lived and fattened off the people, has to say of its wonderful virtues. And in the same address he further said:

"You can count upon the fingers of one hand the wealthy woolen manufacturers of America."

Yes, gentlemen; when it gets through with its system of extermination you can count them on one finger of your hand. And further he said:

"That a suit of clothes bought for the President of the United States"—

mark you, making the President the personage of the suit of clothes—

"yields a profit to the man who made the cloth of not over 38 cents on the suit; and these figures have been challenged by gentlemen from Pennsylvania, who have stated that their profits were less than one-half that. I have seen overcoats made of cloth of my mills—and overcoats for boys—whose profits were less than 9 cents."

Now, gentlemen, you see that this corporation, so much imposed upon, is making practically nothing on the product it is putting out for the American people. If we were to believe this, it would have long since been out of business. This they do: Sell their goods at practically no profit when they wish to crush some competitor out of business. This is one of the tricks of the trade; but when he is crushed out of business, the 38 cents profit rises to something like twenty times that.

We do not wonder that tariff legislation should engender such a fight upon the floor of the House when we consider that under high protection there has grown up such gigantic monopolies as the Standard Oil Co., the United States Steel Co., the American Sugar Refining Co., and the American Tobacco Co., each having its specific field of prey; and the American Woolen Co., which preys upon all the people. Under this high-protective system of the Republican Party these abuses have grown and flourished.

The Chinese Government, further back than history records, must have labored for a thousand years to build a wall 1,500 miles long, 50 feet high, and about 30 feet wide, of solid masonry, to prevent the robbers of the north from coming down upon their lands and robbing the country of its wealth and property. The Republican Party has been 40 years engaged in building a high-tariff wall around the United States in order that the robbers may be kept in, so as to prey upon the people. [Applause.]

And this is not the only country which has been infested with this class of persons or corporations, but back in the eighteenth century—take from one of the noted writers of that day this famous passage:

"These vampires were corpses who went out of their graves at night to suck the blood of the living, either at their throats or stomachs, after which they returned to their cemeteries. The person so sucked waned, grew pale, and fell into consumption, while the sucking corpses grew fat, got rosy, and enjoyed an excellent appetite. It was in Silesia, Hungary, Austria, Moravia, and Lorraine that the dead made this good cheer. We never heard a word of vampires in London or in Paris. I confess that in both these cities there were stockjobbers, men in business, that sucked the blood of the people in broad daylight; but they were not dead, but corrupt. These true suckers lived not in cemeteries, but in very agreeable places."

These corpses compare very favorably to our modern trust corporation—without a soul, without any regard for the Government or the people of the Government, without any regard for church or state, without any moral idea of their duty to their fellow man, without sympathy, cold, bloodless, heartless; in fact, corpses; and there is no better word to describe it—those who go about and suck the blood of the American people. [Applause.]

It has been suggested that under the late decision of our Supreme Court, and in order to fit the present exigencies of government and conduct of our people and trust corporations to the Ten Commandments, that the words "reasonable" or "unreasonable" should be read into each of them. For instance: "Thou shalt not unreasonably do so and so." The eighth commandment should read thus: "Thou shalt not steal an unreasonable amount, and thou shalt not bear the penalty therefor if you are found guilty if it shall in anywise disturb any *big business interests*." Or when the court in sentencing a prisoner says to the prisoner, "Stand up; what have you to say why judgment should not be passed upon you?" And the answer, "Well, I have robbed and taken only a reasonable amount in a reasonable manner." "That will do; the sentence of the court is that you may continue your robbing in a reasonable manner for six months, after which time you must cease such operations." [Applause.]

These several factories comprising the American Woolen Co. that I have described, then surrender their charters and all combine under one trust charter and issue new stock for five or six times the value of their several plants. They can put upon the market one-half of these stocks to the unsuspecting public and receive therefor in cash two and a half times what their 34 plants are really worth and yet retain the other half of the stock and with it control the directorate and management of the corporation.

The question now comes up, How can this corporation pay dividends on such an inflated capital?

It now begins by raising the prices on its 60,000 varieties of cloth 36 per cent. Next, it commences to cheapen its products by the use of South Sea cotton, both in the chain and filling, and of shoddy and such other inferior stuff as it can get to fill into its goods, thereby imposing upon the public an inferior cloth, which will not stand in either color or material. Next, it prepares the coarse No. 3 wool, which is considered the lowest and most inferior class of wool under the Payne-Aldrich bill, and weaves it into a fair-looking cloth. Next, it goes to the woolgrower and reduces the price of his wool 10 cents on the pound. Is that not going some to make dividends? What next does it do to make dividends? There are certain ingredients, appliances, machinery, and chemicals used in the business to be supplied at its different works. The man who has sold to them heretofore goes to the old stand and finds that Company No. 1 will give him only 50 per cent as much for this material as he formerly received. He goes to the next plant, and to another, and receives the same reply, only 50 per cent. He inquires the reason for this reduction of price and says that he has been to four different plants, and all that he can get for his property is one-half of the former price. He is now informed that these several factories have formed a combine, or trust, and are now one company, and that they practically buy all such supplies and that there is no other market for them, and consequently they fix the price at 50 cents on the dollar, and if he does not choose to take that he can keep his material. Here they begin to make dividends again.

But this is not all. Here are men and women who have coined their life blood, muscle, bone, and sinew into a particular kind of work, and by their diligence and skill have made these mills a success. They are told that their wages hereafter will be a certain reduction; or they can turn out so much more piecework than formerly for their day's work. They remonstrate and threaten to quit their employment and to go to another plant. But there is no other work; they all belong to the same octopus. These laborers' lives and energies have been trained in this work; they can do nothing else. They have the alternative to be turned out on the commons or take just whatever this trust employer may choose to offer, and so they make dividends again.

Truly, a commercial despotism has been and is sapping the life of the people. These trusts have become partners with our Government and have written the tariff schedules for the past 25 years in their own interest and in the interests of monopoly. Schedule K, when last enacted, was written in the interest of the American Woolen Co.

The dealers in the stock of this Woolen Trust, when my resolution was introduced on May 3 to make an investigation of its questionable methods, caused a decline in the price of its common stock from 35 to 33, and its preferred stock also wavered downward, and later it was currently reported that this investigation would not be had, when its common stock was advanced from 33 to 34 and the preferred from 90½ to 95. There is evidently something rotten in the make-up and management of this corporation, there being \$29,501,100 common stock, which was issued by way of bonus and represents no value whatever.

Not only has the civilian felt the clutch of the power of this trust, but it has had the effrontery to hold up the United States Army and has been furnishing to it its worsted goods exclusively. The War Department, recognizing it to be a trust, on May 24, 1911, advertised for bids for woollens for the Army. They stated that trust conditions exist in this worsted industry and have decided to break the grip of the American Woolen Trust. This is a commendable position for our Army officers to take and gives strength and dignity to the organization. We certainly think it time to take drastic measures against this octopus, for whatever tariff legislation we may enact, so long as it exists, will fall short of giving the people proper relief.

We now proceed to take up the bill as proposed by the committee and discuss it from a practical and business point of view.

The advent of wool growing and woolen manufacturing began with the Government. Just across the Potomac, at Arlington, Washington, our first President, began to rear one of the first flocks in the country and encourage sheep husbandry, and whose Arlington long-wool sheep, as they were called, were far famed. When he stood up to take his first oath of office—and the first presidential oath ever taken—he was clothed in woollens made from the first woolen mills in Connecticut—American-manufactured goods. The sheep industry, therefore, is interwoven with our earliest history, and the encouragement of manufactured woollens was the first concern of our infant Republic.

In Wright's "Wool Growing and the Tariff," Harvard's economic studies, at page 22, we find that—

In the year 1810 the State of New York, in order to encourage sheep raising, gave a premium of \$80, in the nature of a bounty, to each

county for the best specimen of manufactured woolen cloth; and in the year 1807 passed a law giving a premium of \$50 to each county for the finest merino ram imported into each county.

But it now appears that our legislators from that great State have lost the moorings and traditions of their fathers, and now come here advocating free wool and a destruction of that great industry which their fathers were so intent on building up. Possibly the present generation is more interested in fleecing the "lambs" on the Wall Street Stock Exchange, and in giving the Wool Trust free wool with which to exploit the people, than they are in keeping the traditions of their fathers.

The first woolen mill set up and operated west of the Ohio River was operated in Steubenville, in the sixteenth congressional district of Ohio, and for years the manufacture of woolen cloth became quite an industry in that town and vicinity, and to-day one part of that city is known as "Jeans Town" from the name of the goods manufactured there. Sheep-growing industry received early encouragement in this district, and it is a historical fact that to-day the counties of my district and the county adjoining of Brooks, W. Va., and Washington, Pa., produce the finest Merino wool in the world, and to-day in the sixteenth district alone there are 398,000 sheep, and in the great State of Ohio 3,907,055 sheep, of the value of \$16,000,000.

Representing, as I do, such a vast productive industry I can not assent to a bill which, if enacted into law in its present form, will wreck the business and destroy the future hope of every sheep raiser in my district and State.

I shall now consider the present bill upon its merits and from a Democratic standpoint.

The original idea of a tariff was for the purpose of raising revenue for the Government. It was a principle enunciated by our first party leaders and brought down to the present day. This revenue tariff must be levied for the support of governmental expenses, for the Government is ours, and it takes cash and plenty of it to support its varied institutions. The policy of our Government is and always has been to make the foreign importer pay a tax for the privilege of bringing into this country foreign manufactured goods, made by foreign cheap labor, in competition with our domestic goods and labor.

This Government never had any better way of raising revenue than by tariff, and to talk about free trade with everything and every country of the world, until some way is devised to meet the expenses of Government, would be national suicide.

This Government owes to its citizens respectable employment at remunerative wages, and at a wage commensurate with a fair standard of living, and should guarantee to every citizen life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the broadest sense. This is due the spinner and weaver as certainly as to any other employment. It owes to the woolgrower and sheep raiser the same obligation. They supply the wool for our people's clothes, for our Army and Navy. They are the source from which we receive the great food supply of mutton, and which tends to reduce and maintain an equilibrium on the prices of meat throughout the Union.

Each of these classes interested in the production of wool and labor in the factory must bear their share of the expenses of Government, and when there is neither demand nor necessity for ruining them in their occupation we fail to see the reason for doing so.

We have two classes of extremists in this country—the one a free trader who tries to find a home in and to disintegrate the Democratic Party, and the other the high protectionist, who belongs to and has destroyed the Republican Party, who believes in building a wall around the people so high that no foreign goods can come in, thereby promoting monopoly to devour the people.

This high protection has proven to be the canker which has destroyed the vitals of the Government, has enthroned monopoly, and bred trusts, aggregated the resources and wealth of the country in the hands of the few, and enthroned a commercial despotism which is becoming more powerful than the Government itself. Our citizens have long since come to the conclusion that the corporate artificial person, created by law, has become so powerful that there is very little place left for the individual God-made man.

We become astonished when we learn that during the year 1909, 90,000 of our citizens withdrew from our Government and forsook the Stars and Stripes to make their homes in Canada under the British flag. These were agriculturists, the very persons whose interests we are affecting by this bill.

Gen. Hancock was defeated for President because he dared to say that the tariff was a local issue, but if the debates on reciprocity in this House demonstrated anything, it demonstrated that fact. The gentlemen from Washington, North Carolina, and from Maine could stand reciprocity, provided you did not include free lumber. The gentlemen from Dakota could stand

if, too, if you did not include wheat. The gentlemen from the South could stand it so long as it did not interfere with oranges, lemons, rice, sugar, and cotton; still, many of these same gentlemen will rise up in holy horror when you suggest a fair protection for wool and woollens. "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel." And so every specially blessed part of the Union were bobbing up here and there and claiming the incidental protection that a revenue tariff would afford. There are some of these self-same Democrats who absolutely go raving mad over the word "protection," but I, for one, was never disturbed at the sound of that word when it is used solely for revenue, and not made a means to monopoly. The Democratic Party in no platform ever written declared for free wool, but Congress several times undertook to commit our party to free raw wool, and each time its representatives were relegated to private life. In 1887 and 1888 Congress struggled for months to enact the Mills bill and cut the tariff on wool to a minimum, and the party was defeated at the polls at the national election that fall.

Mr. MACON. Does the gentleman know that the Mills bill carried a provision for free wool, and that the Democratic convention which sat in that year specifically indorsed that bill by resolution?

Mr. FRANCIS. They may have indorsed that bill. I do not know.

Mr. MACON. I think I will be able to show the gentleman by the words of the convention that they did that.

Mr. FRANCIS. I will read from the platform. That will probably satisfy the gentleman.

If party principles are to be found anywhere, they would be expected to be found in our party platform. Take, for instance, the platform of 1888, which reads as follows:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations. In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic Party should promote the advantage of such labor by cheapening the cost of necessities of life in the home of every workingman and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment. Upon this question of tariff reform, so closely concerning every phase of our national life, and upon every question involved in the problem of good government, the Democratic Party submits its principles and professions to the intelligent suffrages of the American people.

Does that read like free wool? Does that read like we should let in foreign pauper-made goods to crush out our woollen mills and stop the hum of the spindles and cause them to rust and decay in inactivity and the laborer to come to want? It would have been wise for the Democratic Party to have had this plank in their platform copyrighted, so as to prevent the Republican Party from purloining it in the year 1896, which it did.

In 1894 Congress adopted the Wilson-Gorman free-wool schedule, and our sheep were driven from the hills to the slaughterhouse, and so was the Democratic Party. Thus it was that our Congress twice attempted to foist free raw wool on our people when our party platform did not ask it to do so, and we have seen the consequences.

Now let us read from the message of President Cleveland:

The proposition with which we have to deal is the reduction of the revenue received by the Government and indirectly paid by the people from customs duties. The question of free trade is not involved, nor is there now any occasion for the discussion of the wisdom or expediency of the protective system. Justice and fairness dictate that in any modification of our present laws relating to revenue the interests and industries which have been encouraged by such laws, and in which our citizens have large investments, should not be ruthlessly injured or destroyed. We should also deal with the subject in such manner as to protect the interests of American labor, which is the capital of our workingmen. Its stability and proper remuneration furnish the most justifiable pretext for a protective policy. Within these limitations a certain reduction should be made in our customs revenue.

Does that sound like free wool and free woollen goods?

I have little patience with the man who wishes to place a tariff indiscriminately on wool and woollens. Every tariff must, of necessity, in its workings help some one; but are you going to say that because of this fact we should not levy a tariff at all? Must the man who writes the schedule do so blindfolded and without any discrimination? Certainly not. And when it is levied with care and discrimination, to that extent you are looking after the interests of the producer and laborer of the country; and this is levying tariff for revenue, having regard as to where its burdens shall fall and in order to do the most good to the greatest number of our people. [Applause.]

Schedule K since 1867 has been a contemptible, trust-breeding schedule, written in the interest of the manufacturers.

The schedule as here proposed is upon an *ad valorem* basis, the proper basis on which to frame a wool and woollen tariff.

It is confidently asserted, and the fact is borne out by the proof, that the head officers of the National Woolgrowers' Associa-

tion and the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, of whom the American Woollen Co. is the controlling figure, have allied themselves together to hoodwink the wool producers of this country.

For instance, take the letter of Gordon Dobson, vice president of the Carded Woollen Manufacturers' Association, to the American Sheep Breeders of Chicago, of March 8, which seems to explain the true situation and alliance of these companies, and is as follows:

It is in every way remarkable that you and the National Wool Growers' Association, who claim to represent the woolgrowers, should unite in this work of preventing the woolgrowers from knowing the truth about Schedule K. I have the most reliable information that the officers of the National Wool Growers' Association are as great offenders as you in this work of keeping the woolgrowers in ignorance. About a year ago F. W. Gooding, then president of the National Wool Growers' Association, and another official of that organization had an interview at Boston with Robert Bleakie, a director of the Carded Woollen Manufacturers' Association. Mr. Bleakie explained to them the special privilege under paragraph 366 of the Payne bill, by which washed worsted wool of class 2 was admitted at the single duty of 12 cents a pound. Both President Gooding and his companion denied repeatedly and vigorously that such a rate was imposed by Schedule K. His companion took the copy of the bill out of his bag and read the paragraph over carefully, not only once, but several times, without discovering the joker. Finally, as he was reading it through for the fourth time, President Gooding exclaimed, "Damn it, Pete, they're right." And Pete had to acknowledge that they were right. Just think of it. President Gooding was the head of an association calling itself "National." He was one of the seven woolgrowers who met the five worsted spinners at Chicago on October 15, 1908, and made a "solemn compact" to stand pat on Schedule K, and nevertheless he was ignorant of the fact that that schedule had allowed the worsted spinners since 1867 to import washed wool of class 2 at a single rate of 12 cents a pound. We may well be astonished by such ignorance in a man in a responsible position, but imagine our feelings when the same man a year after he had been informed of that discrimination against the woolgrowers deliberately suppresses President Moir's letter at the Portland convention and thus prevents the rank and file of the woolgrowers from knowing the truth.

From this it is very apparent that the carded-woolen manufacturers have sold their birthright to the worsted manufacturers for a mess of pottage.

Uncle Sam was blind when Schedule K was first written, just as Abraham of old was blind. His son Jacob, the worsted manufacturer, after deluding the Wool Growers' Association and getting them to make a bargain with Esau, the woolly man, put on the worsted fleece and went to Uncle Sam's Ways and Means Committee in the year 1867 and received the blessing in the form of Schedule K, and has kept and maintained it practically ever since, with the assistance of our Government, and has ruled the wool kingdom of this country to the present day.

This Jacob's brother Esau, the real woolly man, has lost his birthright and become tired of his bargain, and it is only through his kicking that the people have discovered the real iniquity of Schedule K. This Schedule K was founded upon the assumption that 4 pounds of grease wool were required to make 1 pound of wool cloth. This is absolutely false, either as an average or as a fact. Its provisions are prohibitive as to the greater part of foreign wool, and especially as to foreign woollen goods. To demonstrate what I say, you have only to look at the character of the wool which is being imported.

There was concealed within this Schedule K a special privilege in the interest of the worsted spinner ever since the year 1867, with the exception of the years 1894 to 1897, during the operation of the Wilson bill. When the Dingley Act was passed this same concealed special privilege was again reenacted in toto, and was retained in the Payne-Aldrich bill entire. This discrimination grew out of three things: First, the system of specific duties; second, the system of classifying wools as Nos. 1, 2, and 3; and, third, the theory that 4 pounds of grease wool were required to make 1 pound of cloth.

Wool varies in shrinkage from 15 to 80 per cent—that is, for example, by taking 100 pounds of wool, some of which, when the dirt and grease are separated from it, will produce 85 pounds of wool and 15 pounds of grease and dirt. Others will produce 20 pounds of clean wool and 80 pounds of dirt and grease. Under this Payne-Aldrich Schedule K some factories can bring in fleece-washed wool, shrinking from 15 to 25 per cent, on which the duty is only 12 cents per pound; while other growths of wool, suited for other kinds of machinery and goods, and are of this heavy grease and shrinkage if washed, are dutiable at 22 cents per pound, and if scoured at 44 cents per pound, which is prohibitory.

There is a specially favored wool, known as skirted wool, which comes in washed at a single specific duty of 12 cents per pound, and 11 cents unwashed; some years as much as 30,000,000 pounds of this, which displaces from 60,000,000 to 80,000,000 pounds of domestic wool by reason of the difference in the shrinkage of the two qualities. This is used principally in our worsted mills, and is a specific privilege and discrimination of the worst kind. This has been going on against the American woolgrower and the carded-woolen manufacturer since the year

1867, excepting the few years that the Wilson bill was in operation. This is a direct discrimination against our Ohio wools as well as against the other wool-producing States, for the American Woolen Co. have chosen to import and purchase this foreign skirted wool, which shrinks from 15 to 20 per cent, in preference to our Ohio fleece, which shrinks from 52 to 65 per cent; and this is the "nigger in the wood pile" or sleeper that underlies Schedule K and makes it so obnoxious to the wool-grower, the wool consumer, and the woolen manufacturers other than the worsted manufacturers. This skirted wool comes into our ports in its natural state at 11 cents duty per pound.

Now, what is skirted wool? How many Members of this House know the meaning and significance of skirted wool? Let me explain: In shearing the sheep these foreign woolgrowers first take off the wool from the legs, belly, buttocks, and neck and head of the sheep, thereby discarding all of the cheap, inferior, dirty, greasy, and heavy parts of the fleece. The balance of the fleece is the choice and finest wool on the sheep. This comes into our ports, under Schedule K, washed, at a duty of 12 cents per pound, and in its natural state at 11 cents per pound.

Now let us demonstrate how this competes with our domestic wools. Some will say that it is a coarse wool and not the kind grown in the United States, which is correct, for much other wool comes in skirted at 11 cents duty. But let me say to you that every yard of worsted cloth made from it displaces a yard of wool cloth, and every pound of this wool imported displaces from 2 to 3 pounds of domestic wool.

For illustration, let us take 20 pounds of this skirted wool, entering our ports, washed, at a duty of 12 cents per pound, as against 20 pounds of our domestic wool.

Now, 20 pounds of skirted loses 20 per cent in cleaning and shrinkage, or 4 pounds, leaving 16 pounds clean wool. Our American wool, 20 pounds, shrinks 60 per cent, or 12 pounds, leaving 8 pounds clean wool. Now, our domestic wool has the whole fleece, composed of all its parts in it, and is worth 60 cents per clean pound, or 8 pounds at 60 cents, which is \$4.80, while this imported wool, being the choice clean wool of the highest possible grade, is worth 90 cents per clean pound, or 16 pounds at 90 cents, which is \$14.40. The value is in the ratio of \$4.80 to \$14.40. By this it will be seen that our domestic wool bears the relation to this skirted foreign wool of 1 to 3. Hence the specific duty of 12 cents on this class of foreign wool will, in fact, when figured by taking into account both quantity and value, represent but one-third of 12 cents duty, which is 4 cents, and this is all the protection the deluded American woolgrower has had since 1867. This analysis will practically be the same upon the skirted wool, which is imported at 11 cents duty per pound, which shrinks only 30 per cent, and the duty paid on each of these grades of wool when compared with ours is 4 cents, and we have now uncovered the real "nigger" in the woodpile.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman 30 minutes more.

Mr. FRANCIS. In order to be informed on this question of skirted wool, on May 15, 1911, I wrote Charles R. Skinner, assistant appraiser of wool in the appraiser's warehouse, New York City, asking him about this character of wool and as to the meaning of skirted wool as received at that port, and received from him the following reply:

DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 15th instant, making inquiry as to the meaning of skirted wool under the present tariff. In reply I inclose a drawing of a skirted wool, with explanations. These wools do not come free—they are very generally classed as wool, class 1, unwashed, duty 11 cents per pound. The duty of 11 cents applies to all parts of the skirted skin.

Very truly,

CHARLES R. SKINNER.

Our imports show that almost all of this wool comes in at 11 cents a pound in the grease, which will not shrink over 25 to 30 per cent, or washed at 12 cents per pound, which shrinks less.

The foregoing illustration shows that by hoodwinking the American people in this way wool has been imported under this specific duty and favored schedule at a very low rate.

It is shown also by the imports that the other large importations of wool are brought in as wool known as No. 3 at the very low rate of 3 and 4 cents duty per pound. These wools are used principally in the manufacturing of carpets, but they also compete to a great extent with our domestic clips, where used in our worsted mills for the coarser clothing.

I again wrote Mr. Skinner on May 18, 1911, and on May 19 I received the following reply:

DEAR SIR: Under paragraph 369 wools of the second class, whether washed or unwashed, being of the English blood, are returned for duty at 12 cents per pound. Wools of the English blood, as a rule, come to this port washed.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES R. SKINNER.

So that it is very apparent that this is the kind of wool which has been largely imported into our country, and the bill under consideration totally puts to rout this shameful discrimination, being framed on an ad valorem basis.

In 1910 there was imported into this country in all \$47,687,293 worth of raw wool. Of this amount there was imported of—

Class 1, at a duty of 11 cents per pound, 107,996,167 pounds, valued at	\$25,147,142
Class 2, at a duty of 12 cents per pound, 26,687,672 pounds, valued at	6,824,079
Class 3, at a duty of 3 and 4 cents per pound, 84,692,274 pounds, valued at	9,309,323
Total	41,280,744

Now, it is seen that nearly all of our importations of wool are brought into the country at 11 and 12 cents under this favored skirting clause, but, in fact, they come in at no greater rate of duty than the carpet wools—that is, 3 and 4 cents per pound—when compared with our domestic wools.

Now, let us take the history of Schedule K, when this skirting clause was written into it in 1867, and mark the effect on the wool market. In 1866 wool was 70 cents. In 1868, immediately after, it dropped to 46 cents per pound. On a gold basis in 1866, 50 cents per pound, down to 34 cents per pound in 1868. So it is very apparent that this was the thing that caused the slump in wool prices at that time.

But our manufacturers and sheep raisers had adjusted their business to this schedule until the Wilson free-wool schedule of 1894 was enacted, when it is seen that wool in 1893 ranged in price from 29 to 33 cents per pound, but in 1895 fell, and ranged in price from 16½ to 20 cents per pound. Will anyone contend for a moment that this did not cause disaster to our business interests?

If the Members of this House have forgotten the effect of this wool schedule upon the country, it will be well to refer to some statistics to refresh their memories. Immediately before the adoption of the Wilson bill there were 47,000,000 sheep in the United States, valued at \$2.66 per head. Immediately after, in the year 1895, the average price of our sheep was \$1.58, not quite the price of a good-sized Shanghai chicken to-day. And in 1896 our sheep numbered 36,800,000, and had fallen off in two years 10,000,000 in number. They had gone to the slaughterhouse, and the business of the sheep raiser was ruined.

Let us now see the effect on importation of wool under the tariff of 1894. In that year there was imported 55,000,000 pounds of wool. This low amount might have been partly on account of the anticipation of a free-wool schedule; but in the year 1895 there was imported 206,000,000 pounds, and in the year 1897 it had increased to the enormous sum of 350,000,000 pounds; and during the same period the imports of manufactured goods, in 1894, was \$19,500,000, while in 1896 the importation had increased to \$53,500,000, both of which causes entirely crushed our woolgrowing industry in this country.

The importation of 350,000,000 pounds of raw wool into the country in 1897 was more wool than was raised in the United States in that year. In the year 1910 our entire product was 321,000,000 pounds, and there was imported by way of manufactured cloth as much, if not more, than that of raw wool, so that it will be seen that under the Wilson bill there came into this country twice as much wool in a single year as was raised in the United States in the year 1910. This proposed bill embodies a lower duty than did the Wilson bill, which let wool come in free and made goods dutiable at 50 per cent. This bill makes wool dutiable at 20 per cent and cloth at 40 per cent. When you deduct the ad valorem from the cloth required to compensate for a 20 per cent duty upon wool, which the foreign manufacturer has free, which would be 12 to 13 per cent, it brings the net duty on a free-wool basis to 27 to 28 per cent, or just a little over half of the Wilson bill, and is a price against which our industries can not compete.

In Canada they have free wool, but the duty on manufactured articles against Great Britain is 30 per cent and 35 per cent against other countries.

Half of the woolen machinery that was operated in Canada 10 years ago is now idle. Considerable of the machinery has been broken up and made into scrap, and not over half of the remaining mills are in operation. They have a lower operating expense than we have and skilled workmen, and it is fair to conclude that if this bill goes into effect this great dual industry of wool manufacturing and wool producing will be crushed, as it was in 1894.

A great deal is said about the price at which an English tailor-made, all-wool suit of clothes can be obtained in Great Britain as compared with the same suit and material in this country.

Great stress is put upon the fact of the wide difference in prices, in support of the claim that the whole trouble is in the

tariff duties between the two countries, when in truth and in fact that enters very little into the matter, and almost the entire difference is in the price of labor bestowed upon the making of the goods in America as compared with the cheap labor of Europe.

Take, for instance, an English-made suit of clothes. The prices entering into such a suit are as follows:

Cloth, 3½ yards.....	\$2.50
Labor for making a sack coat.....	1.75
Labor for making a vest.....	.50
Labor for making trousers.....	.37
Trimmings necessary for the suit, complete.....	1.25
Labor for cutting.....	.50

Total, for making the suit complete and furnishing all materials..... 6.87

This suit will sell in England for \$15.

We will now take an American suit of American goods of the same class:

3½ yards of cloth.....	\$8.50
Labor for making sack coat.....	8.25
Labor for making trousers.....	2.50
Labor for making vest.....	2.00
Good average trimmings, complete.....	4.00
Labor for cutting.....	2.00

Total, for suit complete..... 27.25

This suit will be sold by the American merchant tailor at \$40.

I simply draw this parallel, having obtained it from one who has worked just recently in both countries and is able to give the figures, so as to show that the great discrepancy in these prices is caused by the difference of labor in the two countries. And this will hold good as to the importation of foreign ready-made goods when brought in competition with our ready-made goods.

It will be noticed that the English cloth in this computation costs \$2.50 as against the American-made cloth at \$3.50. This is due to two reasons: First, our trust methods in inflating and putting up the price to the American consumer, as I have already shown; but the principal difference is caused by reason of the comparative cost of labor in this country and in England. This bears the same relation to the manufacture of the cloth as it does to the making of the two suits of clothes, as demonstrated in the foregoing illustration.

A great many persons are laboring under the impression that the high cost of a suit of clothes in this country is directly enhanced by the high tariff on raw wool that is imported into this country to be used in our factories.

When you analyze this proposition it is plain to anyone that the duty on this raw washed wool at 12 cents per pound—there being about 3½ pounds of wool in an all-wool suit of clothes and which is scarcely found among the American makes upon the shelves of our merchant tailors—that this duty of 12 cents a pound on the wool would not make, in the aggregate, to exceed 50 or 60 cents added to that suit of clothes. But under Schedule K the woolen imports of cloth were placed at a prohibitive rate, and from this it can plainly be seen that the American Wool Trust has had the grand opportunity of making prices to suit itself to fleece the people. It is plain to be seen that under Schedule K of the Payne-Aldrich bill it has been so framed that it produces very little revenue on the importation of wool, and, being prohibitive of the importation of manufactured woolen cloth, that there is very little revenue derived from that source. Hence, the American Woolen Trust has the matter of fixing prices in its own hands.

Now, if this tariff would have the effect to drive our sheep to the shambles, then it should not be enacted; or if its operations will be such as to close down our woolen and worsted mills, again I say it should not be enacted. It places a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on raw wool, noil, top, waste, and so forth, and of course this dispenses with the necessity of classifying the different kinds of wool as Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

On combed wool, tops, roving or roping, and so forth, 25 per cent ad valorem.

On yarns, and so forth, 30 per cent ad valorem.

On manufactured woolens an average of about 42½ per cent ad valorem, ranging from 25 per cent to 50 per cent ad valorem, making the principal articles which are shipped into our ports at about 40 per cent ad valorem.

Our Ways and Means Committee have made comparisons for the purpose of this bill with the Wilson-Gorman bill, the Springer bill of 1892, and the Mills bill of 1888.

These last two bills never became law, but were simply the production of a committee, and why they or either of them should be given any consideration in framing the present bill I am at great loss to know. The practical workings of neither

of said proposed bills were ever tested, either in the interest of the people or as revenue producers; there is, in fact, nothing to be gained from a comparison with them, except it be to demonstrate two Democratic failures along free-trade lines, which culminated finally in the free trade Wilson bill, which accomplished the ruin that the other two bills would have done had they become laws.

The advocates of this bill claim it is a revenue producer, and they demonstrate how it shall be obtained by showing how its operations will flood our country by both foreign-made goods and foreign-grown wools.

There is no industry which so nearly concerns all the people of the United States as the woolen industry. It affects every State in the Union in the production of wool and mutton, every wearer of woolen goods, every one of the vast number employed in the 1,213 great woolen plants of our country, which turn out an annual product of manufactured woolens of \$381,000,000. This great woolgrowing industry surprises us when we consider that there are 58,000,000 sheep in the United States, representing a valuation of \$235,000,000, permeating every State in this Union, and every State of the Union has over 100,000 sheep, excepting eight States.

Sheep and wool—Number and farm value of sheep on farms in the United States, 1867-1911.

Year.	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.
1867.....	39,385,000	\$2.50	\$98,644,000
1868.....	38,992,000	1.82	71,053,000
1869.....	37,724,000	1.64	62,037,000
1870.....	40,853,000	1.96	79,876,000
1871.....	31,851,000	2.14	68,310,000
1872.....	31,679,000	2.61	82,768,000
1873.....	33,002,000	2.71	89,427,000
1874.....	33,938,000	2.43	82,353,000
1875.....	33,784,000	2.55	86,278,000
1876.....	35,935,000	2.37	85,121,000
1877.....	35,804,000	2.13	76,362,000
1878.....	35,740,000	2.21	78,898,000
1879.....	38,124,000	2.07	78,965,000
1880.....	40,766,000	2.21	90,231,000
1881.....	43,570,000	2.39	104,071,000
1882.....	45,016,000	2.37	106,596,000
1883.....	49,237,000	2.53	124,366,000
1884.....	50,627,000	2.37	119,903,000
1885.....	50,300,000	2.14	107,661,000
1886.....	48,322,000	1.91	92,444,000
1887.....	44,759,000	2.01	89,873,000
1888.....	43,545,000	2.05	89,280,000
1889.....	42,599,000	2.13	90,640,000
1890.....	44,336,000	2.27	100,660,000
1891.....	43,431,000	2.50	108,397,000
1892.....	44,938,000	2.58	116,121,000
1893.....	47,274,000	2.66	125,909,000
1894.....	45,048,000	1.98	89,186,000
1895.....	42,294,000	1.58	66,686,000
1896.....	38,299,000	1.70	65,168,000
1897.....	36,819,000	1.82	67,021,000
1898.....	37,637,000	2.46	92,721,000
1899.....	39,114,000	2.75	107,698,000
1900.....	41,883,000	2.93	122,666,000
1901.....	59,757,000	2.98	178,072,000
1902.....	62,039,000	2.65	164,446,000
1903.....	63,965,000	2.63	168,316,000
1904.....	61,630,000	2.59	159,530,000
1905.....	45,170,000	2.82	127,332,000
1906.....	50,632,000	3.54	179,056,000
1907.....	53,240,000	3.84	204,210,000
1908.....	54,631,000	3.88	211,736,000
1909.....	56,084,000	3.43	192,632,000
1910.....	57,216,000	4.08	233,664,000
1911.....	3.73

You will notice the falling off in the number, value per head, and farm value of sheep immediately after this skirting clause, which I have explained was enacted in 1867, and also notice the same falling off under the free-wool Wilson bill in 1894.

Our last census has alarmed the Government at the exodus of our population from the farms to city life, until it has become the cry of the nation, "Back to the farm!" But the farmer who raises hay, corn, oats, potatoes, and wheat has extracted from these farms their vitality until they will respond no more. He has taken everything from the soil without replenishing its fertility, and hence they are abandoning them. Let the farmer go back to the farm with his sheep, which enriches the land as they develop and grow; let the order of husbandry be reversed and the lands be rejuvenated by the rearing of sheep, and this national alarm will be dispelled. [Applause.]

Now, can our American woolgrowers compete with foreign wool under these schedules? Can the manufacturers of woolen goods compete with foreign importers under these schedules? These are the two great questions to be solved, and these are the questions which a million American producers and workmen are waiting to hear answered in the affirmative.

Our Ways and Means Committee evidently either has been misinformed as to the number of sheep in the United States or has made a miscalculation. The number given in its table represents the number of sheep of shearing age, and makes no account of lambs and mutton sheep which are marketed each year. The true number and value in January, 1910, is just what I have quoted, but according to the unpublished reports this number has increased in the last year about 10 per cent, and our sheep to-day will number close to 65,000,000 head. The number and kinds of sheep in the five counties comprising the sixteenth district of Ohio, as taken from the latest figures obtainable, is as follows:

Number of sheep on farms April 15, 1910—five counties.

County.	Total sheep.	Lambs.	Ewes.	Rams and wethers.
Belmont.....	93,987	11,340	45,870	36,777
Carroll.....	73,940	7,216	37,619	29,105
Jefferson.....	57,291	7,519	29,764	19,518
Harrison.....	149,704	19,556	67,924	62,224
Monroe.....	23,423	4,014	12,193	7,216
Total.....	398,345	49,645	193,370	154,840

I have not the time to take up item by item in this bill, while I heartily agree that our committee has placed the schedule on an ad valorem duty as the only proper way to collect this revenue. But I am morally certain that this tariff is not sufficiently high to produce the required revenue on either the manufactured goods or on the raw wool and at the same time to do justice to our industries and producers.

Under section 3 of the proposed act the committee has compiled a statement showing the amount of combed wool or tops, roving, etc., manufactured, etc., at a duty which shall be 25 per cent, and what was imported and the duty thereon for the last year, and showing that they estimate that there will be about 700 times as much imported under section 3 of this act as was imported under the Payne-Aldrich Act, and that the revenue will be increased about 150 times as much. This does not sound good to those who are interested in the production of wool and woolsens in this country. This boldly asserts that this vast sum represents just so much foreign labor, withdrawn from and taken away from American industries.

Their summary proposes to receive annually under this bill about \$20,000,000 worth of wool more than under the former act.

But the worst feature of the whole matter is that this bill proposes to let in to our ports forty and a half million dollars more annually of woolsens than did the former act.

That by reason of this low tariff, almost to a free-trade basis, they propose to flood our country with wool and woolsens. This was demonstrated under the Walker tariff law of 1846. I read from the American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century, volume 2, page 92:

It is not too much to say that the new tariff practically ruined the woolen industry, which had revived and become fairly flourishing under the protection it received under the act of 1842. The ambitious manufacturers of that time began the production of fine broadcloths, which in quality equaled any that were made in the world. But the act of 1846 put an end to the industry. When that tariff went into operation there were 1,800 looms, chiefly in New England, weaving broadcloth. Within a few years every one of them had stopped or had been diverted to the production of an inferior grade of goods. The blanket manufacture also was destroyed. The rate of duty on the coarse wool used in making blankets, which was imported and not produced in the country, was 30 per cent, but the duty on blankets was only 20 per cent. The law therefore operated as a prohibition upon the manufacture. "The only branches of wool manufacture which continued with any great activity were those which, like flannels, were supplied by the common wool of the country, so superior in its spinning qualities as in itself to afford an advantage over the foreign manufacture. There was no longer a demand for any but the common wools, and the Saxony wool industry, which had recently made great progress among the New England farmers, disappeared with the manufacture of fine cloths, which had brought it into existence." All writers agree that the period was one of extreme depression, of disappointment, and disaster. The importations of foreign fabrics of wool increased greatly as the domestic industry declined. The value of woolen manufactures imported in 1846 was \$10,000,000; in 1855 it was \$22,000,000.

I read again from the same work, at page 308, as to the operation of the Wilson bill. This is evidently compiled with some care and may have a little coloring from a Republican pen, but the facts and statistics remain unchanged.

Inasmuch as the great feature of the then existing tariff was free wool he made much of the disastrous result of the experiment. The importation of wool in 1896 was three times as much as in 1893, and the quantity of woolen manufactures imported was twice as great, yet the revenue from the articles named in the wool schedule was diminished almost one-half—the receipts having been only \$23,000,000, a loss of \$21,000,000. "In other words," he said, "by placing wool on the free list and reducing the duties on the manufactures of wool the Treasury lost \$21,000,000 of revenue, our farmers lost a market for the 80,000,000 pounds of wool which they raised in 1892 in excess of what they raised in 1897-98, as well as nearly 10 cents a pound in price, involving a loss to them of nearly \$30,000,000 per annum on this one

farm product; and our manufacturers and their workmen lost a market not only for the goods which foreign imports had supplanted, but also a market for the goods which the farmers and masses of the people were able to purchase in 1893, but which they could not buy in 1896 because of a loss of employment and purchasing power." At the same time, he remarked, it had been demonstrated that free wool did not effect an increase of an exportation of woolen manufactures, but that it had been followed by an increase in the importation of shoddy. Not to discuss the question whether all the evils mentioned were a direct consequence of the wool and woolen schedule in the act of 1894, it seems to be beyond question that some of them were. At all events, it is a fact that during the continuance of that act both wool growing and wool manufacturing suffered more severely than did most industries from the depression of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. FRANCIS. Wright's Wool seems to be the leading work on wool and the wool tariff in this country. At page 299, speaking of the Wilson bill, it says:

Then followed the régime of free wool under the Wilson tariff, together with severe industrial depression, and about two-fifths of the sheep were disposed of. The losses fell heaviest upon the States where sheep had been most numerous, and in some cases amounted to one-half of the flocks.

Now, this extra importation of \$20,000,000, as proposed by this bill, paid out by our Government for wool to be supplied to its people, and this forty and a half million of dollars paid for manufactured goods, represents in all sixty and a half million dollars in gold, dipped out of the money of our country and out of circulation and distributed in foreign countries.

But this is not all; this forty and one-half millions of dollars worth of manufactured goods coming into our ports to supply our people represents a labor bestowed thereon of one-half of its value, or twenty and one-half million dollars; this work is to be performed on foreign shores while our workmen stand idly by. Do you know how many laborers employed for a whole year at a monthly salary of \$50 this will supplant in the United States? Just 33,750 at the least calculation, at an annual wage of \$600. This extra sixty and one-half millions of dollars of imports of wool and woolsens will so far crush the wool producer that he will have to abandon his business, and many of his laborers be thrown out of employment, and we will have 100,000 men, women, and children searching for other employment and crowding the other fields of labor in order to obtain a livelihood.

Can the wool producer of our country exist in the face of these duties? If not, we should not enact them, unless we can all agree that he has no right to exist. We should take into consideration, in discussing this question, the standard of American living, wages, education, and citizenship.

The raw wool with which our country competes is chiefly the medium grade of combing wools or the cross breeds of the merino. Those wools are raised on practically free range or on lands valued at from 50 cents to \$5 per acre, and where the equable climate requires little or no winter feeding. Much of the wool is grown in Argentina, Bolivia, and in Australia.

Much of the wool which enters into the manufactured cloth and raw wool is grown under the care of a herder who wears a tuft of hair for a hat and a breechclout for a suit of clothes. Are we willing to throw our ports open to this kind of competition?

Due consideration of this question convinces me that any reduction of the woolen schedule should provide for the lowering of the duties upon the manufactured woolsens from the present Schedule K; and while this might cut the profits of the combine, it would certainly give a reasonable profit and at the same time reduce the cost to the American people of the garments they have to wear.

Better a reduction of the profit of the manufacturers and lower prices to the laboring man for his clothes, and it is highly proper that this should be accomplished on an ad valorem basis.

I am earnestly in favor of the revision of this tariff in the interest of all the American people, and by the American people, and not in the interests of its beneficiaries—The American Wool Trust. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wool and the manufactures of wool, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. REYBURN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for three weeks, on account of important business.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order heretofore made for eulogies on the memory of the late Hon. AMOS L. ALLEN, a Representative from Maine, be so amended that the time of meeting to-morrow shall be 12.30 o'clock instead of 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that the order heretofore adopted fixing the hour of noon to-morrow as the beginning of the session for eulogies on the late Hon. AMOS L. ALLEN, of Maine, be changed to 12.30 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER designated Mr. McGILLICUDDY to preside at the session to-morrow.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, June 11, 1911, at 12.30 p. m.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 11475) to authorize the sale of burnt timber on the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 11476) to amend chapter 370, paragraph 3, page 424, volume 30, of the United States Statutes at Large; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11477) authorizing the construction of a railroad, tramroad, conveyor, wagon, or foot bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Matewan Station, in Mingo County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 11478) to quiet title and possession with respect to a certain unconfirmed and located private-land claim in Baldwin County, Ala., in so far as the records of the General Land Office show said claim to be free from conflict; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11479) to allow the entry of coal lands located under circular of Department of the Interior, dated March 21, 1908; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11480) granting pensions to the surviving members and widows of members of the Forsythe Scouts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11481) to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to procure postal cars and contract for hauling them, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11482) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers and granting them 30 days' leave per annum; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11483) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 11484) authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 11485) to define and punish contempts of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Resolution (H. Res. 200) authorizing the payment of the expenses of the committee appointed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, or the chairman thereof, to investigate and make inquiry into the various departments of government in the District of Columbia, and into the management and conduct of all public-utility corporations doing business in said District; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CARY: A memorial joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializing Congress to grant Alaska a territorial form of Government; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin, petitioning for a national constitutional convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to take proper steps for the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing that such Constitution may be amended hereafter by initiative; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin, petitioning Congress to take proper steps toward a constitutional amendment providing for initiative, referendum, and recall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 11486) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 11487) granting a pension to Newel P. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11488) granting a pension to Wilson Decker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 11489) for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Hathaway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 11490) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Abbot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 11491) to correct the military record of John Sanspree; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11492) granting a pension to James L. Herod; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11493) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11494) to authorize the issuance of a patent to H. W. Slaughter for land located in Clarke County, State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11495) granting an increase of pension to Garrett Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11496) for the relief of J. H. Cravey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11497) granting an increase of pension to Perry S. Grindle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11498) granting a pension to Abigail Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11499) granting a pension to Frank L. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11500) granting an increase of pension to William Duckworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11501) granting an increase of pension to George W. Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11502) granting an increase of pension to William H. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11503) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11504) granting an increase of pension to John S. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11505) granting an increase of pension to Parley Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11506) granting an increase of pension to William N. Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11507) granting an increase of pension to Harmon Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11508) granting an increase of pension to John Philip Ebel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11509) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Forry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11510) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11511) granting an increase of pension to George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11512) granting an increase of pension to Hester A. Snodgrass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11513) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Preble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11514) granting an increase of pension to William R. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11515) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Pearce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11516) granting an increase of pension to Dyer C. Elder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11517) granting an increase of pension to Michael Glaub; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 11518) for the relief of Ryland J. Shuck; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 11519) granting a pension to Harriet W. Cushing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 11520) granting a pension to Jesse H. Wade; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11521) granting an increase of pension to Orren R. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11522) granting an increase of pension to James W. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 11523) granting an increase of pension to Clark Bullock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11524) granting an increase of pension to B. F. Lemon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11525) granting an increase of pension to Louisa B. Highley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11526) granting an increase of pension to John Stander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11527) granting an increase of pension to John M. Heatherly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 11528) for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11529) granting a pension to James Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11530) granting a pension to Louie E. Downard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11531) granting a pension to William L. Laws; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11532) granting a pension to Clay Brandenburg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11533) granting a pension to Joseph F. Fike; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11534) granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11535) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11536) granting an increase of pension to Kels Risner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 11537) granting a pension to Catharine Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11538) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas A. Bovee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 11539) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 11540) granting an increase of pension to John Bonecutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11541) for the relief of Thomas T. Munhall; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLINE: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Wilson Decker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, protest of business men of La Grange, Garrett, and Angola, Ind., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Resolutions adopted by the Red Wing (Minn.) Manufacturers' Association, requesting amendment to corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. E. Friedrich and others, Red Wing, Minn., asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: Petition of citizens of Jefferson and Ripley Counties, Ind., for reduction of duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of E. L. Scribner and 11 others, of Otisfield, Me., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, condemning the manner of the arrest of the McNamaras and indorsing Mr. BERGER's resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Clarence Holcomb, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Mrs. E. Costberg and 21 others, of Berkeley, and C. L. Leighton and 21 others, of Petaluma, Cal., protesting against Senate bill 237; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, asking that the tariff be taken off sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky for the passage of the Sulloway pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Irvine, Ky., protesting against the proposed parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of the Rock Island Plow Co., of Rock Island, Ill., transmitting resolutions of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association favoring a change in the date for making returns under the Federal corporation tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of numerous addresses in Nebraska, requesting an investigation of the arrest in the McNamara case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petitions of citizens of Fannin County, Tex., favoring reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Goodlett, Hardeman County, Tex., favoring reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of Homer L. Boyle, suggesting the appointment of a permanent committee on the affairs of peace; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Retail Druggists' Association of Lansing, Mich., opposing enactment of stamp tax on patent and proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. E. Holmes and other citizens of Mount Morris, Mich., in favor of a reduction of the duty on sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. M. O'Dell and other citizens of Webberville and Williamston, Mich., opposing House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of druggists of Williamston and Webberville, Mich., opposing enactment of stamp tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Edward A. Furniss and 70 other veterans of the Civil War, of Delaware County, Ohio, asking for the enactment of the Anderson pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, June 11, 1911.

The House met at 12.30 o'clock p. m., and was called to order by Mr. MCGILLICUDDY, as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we are assembled here in memory of a departed Member of this House who served his State and Nation with fidelity and ability. Modest, yet firm; without ostentation, yet with patriotic zeal and fervor; a member of a Christian church; zealous in all good works; respected, esteemed, loved by all.

We mourn him, but not as dead; rather as living in another of God's many mansions where, with the same patience, fidelity, and zeal in the service of the King, he is faring on. Help us to emulate his virtues that we may leave behind us a clean record. Comfort, we beseech Thee, his colleagues and friends, and let Thine everlasting arms be about those who were near and dear to him in the bonds of kinship to sustain and comfort them; and bring us all in Thine own good time to dwell with Thee in heaven. In the name of Him who is the resurrection and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE ALLEN, OF MAINE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. HINDS, by unanimous consent, "Ordered, That there be a session of the House on Sunday, June 11, at 12 m., and that the said session be devoted to eulogies on the life, character, and public services of AMOS L. ALLEN, late a Representative from the State of Maine."

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, before the exercises begin to-day, I ask unanimous consent that Members be allowed to print.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that Members be allowed to print their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.